

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

3 CASE NO. 1:22-cv-24066-KMM

4 GRACE, INC., et al.,
5 Plaintiffs,
6 vs.
7 CITY OF MIAMI,
8 Defendant.

9
10 DEPOSITION BY VIDEOCONFERENCE

11 OF

12 DR. CAROLYN ABOTT

13
14
15
16 Monday, October 16th, 2023
17 9:03 a.m. to 1:29 p.m.
18 By Videoconference
19
20
21

22 Taken on behalf of the Defendant by
23 Mayra Texeira, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public
24 in and for the State of Florida at Large, pursuant
25 to Notice of Taking Deposition in the above cause.

REMOTE APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Plaintiffs: (Via Videoconference)

DECHERT LLP

Cira Center-2929 Arch Street

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

BY: CHRISTOPHER J. MERKEN, ESQUIRE

On behalf of the Defendant: (Via Videoconference)

GRAY|ROBINSON

301 S. Bronough Street

Suite 600

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

BY: GEORGE T. LEVESQUE, ESQUIRE

Also Present:

Nicholas Warren, Esquire/ACLU

- - - - -

I N D E X

Witness	Direct	Cross
Dr. Carolyn Abott	3,117	115

E X H I B I T I N D E X

Defendant's	Description	Page No.
Exhibit 1	Trial Report	123

1 THE COURT REPORTER: Dr. Abott,
2 can you show your ID by holding it up to
3 the camera for me?
4 (Witness presented government-issued identification
5 and identity was verified.)

6 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Please
7 raise your right hand. Do you swear that the
8 testimony you will give in this cause will be
9 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
10 truth so help you God?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
12 Thereupon:

13 DR. CAROLYN ABOTT
14 was called as a witness and, having been first duly
15 sworn remotely, was examined and testified as
16 follows:

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

19 Q. Good morning, Doctor. My name is
20 George Levesque. I'm with Gray Robinson and we
21 represent the City of Miami in this case. Before we
22 get started, can you please state your full name for
23 the record.

24 A. Sure. It's Carolyn Abott. Carolyn Beth
25 Abott.

1 Q. And have you ever been deposed before?

2 A. I have not.

3 Q. Have you ever given testimony live in
4 court before?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Okay. I'm going to go over a few of the
7 ground rules for this deposition this morning. One
8 of the ground rules is, particularly because we're
9 on Zoom and when people talk over each other it can
10 get a little confusing, the format is I'll be asking
11 questions, you'll be providing answers. If you could
12 wait until I finish my question and then provide
13 your answer, that will help the court reporter, who
14 is taking down everything that we say, transcribe
15 things accurately. If I ask a question and you
16 provide an answer, I'm going to assume that you
17 understood the question that I asked and are
18 answering the question that I asked. Is that fair?

19 A. Yeah.

20 Q. At various points your counsel may object
21 to questions that I ask. We may have a colloquy
22 related to his objection. But if -- unless he's
23 instructed you not to answer, I'll probably come
24 back to you and say if you understand the question
25 you can answer. And then if you understand the

1 question, please answer. If you don't ask me to
2 repeat or rephrase and I can do my best to do that.
3 Is that fair?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Also, because we're on Zoom this might not
6 be as big of a problem, but there are going to be
7 certain questions that might be a yes answer or a no
8 answer. For the purposes of creating a record I'll
9 need you to answer audibly. If you shake your head
10 or nod your head, I can see it on video what you
11 mean, but it makes it a little more difficult for
12 the court reporter to take that down. I might say,
13 well, is that a yes or is that a no. I'm not doing
14 it to be rude. I'm doing it to make sure that we're
15 getting an accurate reflection of the record.

16 This morning, are you on any medication
17 that would impair your ability to testify truthfully
18 or recall your report in this matter?

19 A. No.

20 Q. How did you -- how did you --

21 MR. MERKEN: George, just quickly --

22 A. I am a Type I diabetic so I'm on insulin,
23 but at any point if my blood sugar starts going low
24 I'll need to take a break just so I can have some
25 glucose.

1 Q. Understood. And this is not intending to
2 be the Spanish Inquisition or anything like that. If
3 at any point you need to take a bathroom break or if
4 you feel your blood sugar is dropping, please let us
5 know. We can take a break. The one thing that I
6 would ask -- obviously, if you're in a medical
7 emergency we can address that, but the one thing
8 that I would ask is if there is a question pending
9 that we answer the question pending and then we can
10 take a break. Is that fair?

11 A. Sure.

12 Q. How did you come to offer an expert
13 opinion in this case?

14 A. I was contacted by Nick Warren.

15 Q. And how do you know Mr. Warren?

16 A. He contacted me. I had not known him
17 beforehand.

18 Q. Okay. And what did Mr. Warren ask you to
19 do?

20 A. He asked me if I was available to serve as
21 an expert witness on this case versus the City of
22 Miami and the drawing of the maps for the districts.

23 Q. And did you agree to become an expert in
24 this case then?

25 A. I did.

1 Q. And how much have you been compensated to
2 date for your services?

3 A. I don't know to date.

4 Q. What is your hourly rate?

5 A. \$450.

6 Q. Can you ballpark how many hours you've
7 worked on it?

8 A. I can't. It's been over the course of a
9 year or so.

10 Q. Is it more than 10,000?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Is it more than 5,000?

13 MR. MERKEN: George, objection to
14 form. Are you asking the number of hours
15 or the dollar amount?

16 MR. LEVESQUE: I'm asking -- I'm
17 sorry. Fair point. I'll rephrase.

18 Q. Have you billed for your services in this
19 matter?

20 A. I have billed. Yes.

21 Q. Have you billed more than \$5,000 in
22 services for this matter?

23 A. I don't know the answer to that. I'd have
24 to look at my records.

25 Q. So as we sit here today you have no idea

1 how many hours that -- or how many dollars you've
2 billed for your services?

3 A. I can't give you a dollar amount right
4 now. It's been several, you know, checks that have
5 been written over the course of a year.

6 Q. So -- and, again, I'm not looking for an
7 exact dollar amount, I'm looking for a ballpark
8 range. Would it be more than \$5?

9 A. Yes. It would be more than \$5.

10 Q. Okay. Would it be less than \$100,000?

11 A. Yes. It would be less than \$100,000.

12 Q. Okay. So are you able to narrow it between
13 more than \$5 and less than \$100,000?

14 A. I would have -- it would be a guess. I
15 couldn't tell you for sure. But it's certainly less
16 than \$50,000, certainly less -- not certainly. I
17 believe it's less than \$20,000.

18 Q. Which attorneys have you communicated with
19 concerning this case?

20 A. I have communicated with Nick Warren. I've
21 communicated with Christopher. And Neil. And Kerri.
22 And I can't recall everyone's last name.

23 Q. And have they provided you with any facts
24 or data that you have considered in forming your
25 opinions?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What facts did they provide you with?

3 A. They have told me the generals of the case
4 and what the case was about. They have provided me
5 with maps.

6 Q. Did they provide you with any data?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Now, when you reference the generals of
9 the case, what are the generals of the case to the
10 extent that you can recall?

11 A. The generals of the case are that after
12 the 2020 census, the City of Miami needed to
13 redistrict for population reasons. Their city
14 commission districts and the plaintiffs believe that
15 the districts were not drawn in such a way as to
16 take into account proper concerns, particularly with
17 regard to race and ethnicity.

18 Q. When you say that the districts were not
19 drawn to take into account proper concerns regarding
20 race and ethnicity, can you explain that?

21 A. I just need to say that they -- they were
22 sorting certain areas and precincts based upon race
23 and ethnic concerns and considerations.

24 Q. Did they provide any other background
25 information to you that you relied on in forming

1 your opinions?

2 A. No.

3 Q. What did you do to prepare your work and
4 your opinions in this case?

5 A. Can you clarify what you mean by prepare?

6 Q. Sure. You have drafted a couple of
7 different reports that have been provided to us.
8 What did you do in preparation of those reports?

9 A. Do you mean beyond collecting data and
10 analyzing the data? I'm still not sure what you
11 mean by prepare.

12 Q. Well, let's back up. What did plaintiffs
13 ask you to do in this case?

14 A. So as I wrote in my first expert report I
15 was asked to use data from the census and from the
16 ACS, the American Community Survey, to look at
17 voting patterns within individual precincts and
18 portions of precincts to determine whether and to
19 what extent race can explain the shapes of the 2022
20 enacted plan and the changes between the 2013 and
21 the 2022 enacted plan. So that was what they asked
22 me to do.

23 Q. Okay. And what did you do to fulfill that
24 request?

25 A. I downloaded data from the census and from

1 the ACS. What else? I received city commission
2 maps, incumbent addresses. And then other data was
3 downloaded from Verse, which is on Harvard's
4 website. And then another expert witness, Dr. Moy,
5 provided me with additional results. Once that data
6 was downloaded I was able to analyze the data, look
7 for patterns in the data, map them on to shape files
8 of maps and precincts, and come to conclusions based
9 on my analysis.

10 Q. And what methodology did you use to
11 perform your analysis?

12 A. Standard methodology. Looking at data.
13 Looking at patterns. At the very early stage looking
14 at relationships before and after the maps were
15 enacted, the 2013 to 2022 maps.

16 Q. Did you review any news articles?

17 A. I did see a handful of news articles.

18 Q. And the handful of news articles that
19 you're referencing, were those provided by counsel?

20 A. They were not.

21 Q. Is that research that you conducted
22 yourself?

23 A. It was.

24 Q. Do any of those news articles factor in to
25 your opinions that are detailed in your report?

1 A. No.

2 Q. Did you do any historical research related
3 to the City's redistricting plans?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Is the CV that is attached to your report
6 current?

7 A. I don't have which CV you have.

8 Q. Okay. Give me one second. What I am going
9 to do is I am going to share in the Dropbox on the
10 chat your trial report. Let me see if I can --

11 MR. MERKEN: George, we also have a
12 copy of it in paper here if that's
13 easier.

14 MR. LEVESQUE: Is it the trial
15 report?

16 MR. MERKEN: Can I direct her to
17 that? Is that all right?

18 MR. LEVESQUE: Yes. That's fine.

19 MR. MERKEN: So this is at the end of
20 the second expert report. This is the CV
21 right here. So if you go to the end of
22 that, it's after page 22 of the second
23 report.

24 THE WITNESS: I see it. Okay.

25 MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. If we could go

1 off the record very quickly.

2 (Discussion off the record.)

3 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

4 Q. Dr. Abott, you have your trial report in
5 front of you?

6 A. Yes. Yes.

7 Q. Are you able to refer to that and let me
8 know if that reflects the latest and greatest for
9 your work that is contained in your CV?

10 A. It is not the most up to date, but it
11 contains -- I mean, it's accurate. It's just --
12 there are a few additions since this printed.

13 Q. Okay. What are the things that would be
14 added to this?

15 A. Well, my book is under contract. I have
16 additional research in progress. Additional working
17 papers. Additional invited talks and presentations.
18 Additional grants.

19 Q. And were those all commenced after this
20 report was provided to us?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. If I could ask you to refer to page 3 of
23 your report.

24 A. Is this the first report?

25 Q. Yes.

1 A. Okay. Yeah.

2 Q. Under sources and methodology you say, in
3 preparing this report I've relied on my personal
4 knowledge gathered through my years of researching,
5 studying, and publishing.

6 Is there any knowledge or experience that
7 you would not have relied on in terms of forming
8 your opinions that are not detailed in your CV?

9 A. No.

10 Q. In the next paragraph you say, I also
11 utilized the standard methodology that political
12 scientists use when investigating precinct and
13 census data.

14 What exactly do you mean by standard
15 methodology?

16 A. I suppose I just mean what political
17 scientists do when they download and analyze data
18 from the census, and election data, which is what I
19 described earlier, looking for patterns.

20 Q. Is there a name for the methodology that
21 you've used?

22 A. I don't -- I don't believe -- I would say
23 it's quantitative, but nothing more specific than
24 that.

25 Q. Are there academic journals or other

1 sources that one could go to to understand what
2 standard methodology you're referring to?

3 A. I don't believe there would be articles
4 written specifically about how to analyze election
5 data in particular. This analysis is typically
6 contained -- an explanation analysis is typically
7 contained in every article, a thorough explanation
8 of how the analysis was done, how the data was
9 collected. But, generally speaking, if you want a
10 primer on quantitative analysis, that's a more
11 general field that has been applied to election
12 analysis.

13 Q. Further down in that paragraph you
14 reference that you relied on the 2019 American
15 Community Survey five-year estimates. Would you
16 agree that the 2019 American Community Survey
17 five-year estimate data is an estimate?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. When were you first engaged to work on
20 this matter?

21 A. I would have to go back and look at my
22 e-mails.

23 Q. Is there a reason why you used the 2019
24 ACS data versus the 2021 ACS data?

25 A. I was asked by counsel to use that data. I

1 can speculate about why, but I was asked to use that
2 data.

3 Q. Were you instructed not to use the 2021
4 ACS data?

5 A. No. No. No.

6 Q. What is your understanding of the
7 difference between the 2019 and the 2021 ACS data?

8 A. They take place in different years. Their
9 estimates are different points in time.

10 Q. Is that the only difference?

11 A. I don't know.

12 Q. You mentioned that the city commission
13 district maps and incumbent addresses were provided
14 to you by counsel. For the incumbent addresses, do
15 you recall what those were?

16 A. The actual address?

17 Q. Yes.

18 A. No.

19 Q. Well, for example, in District 3, if we
20 wanted to know where the commissioner in District 3
21 lives, how would we go about finding that in terms
22 of your consideration for your report?

23 A. Sorry. Can you rephrase that? I couldn't
24 hear you.

25 Q. Sure. If we wanted to know what your

1 understanding of the address for the commissioner
2 for District 3, how would we figure that out?

3 A. My understanding of that?

4 Q. Yes.

5 A. How would you know -- how would you figure
6 it out? I suppose you would have to ask me. I
7 mean --

8 Q. Okay. Do you know where the commissioner
9 in District 3 lives?

10 A. I -- I could point to a general part of
11 the map. I couldn't tell you his actual -- his exact
12 address.

13 Q. Well, and I guess my question is, you
14 don't detail where the commissioners lived in your
15 report. Correct?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. So if I wanted to verify that, yes, in
18 fact that is the commissioner's address, how would I
19 go about doing that?

20 A. Verify what is his address?

21 Q. What you believe to be his address.

22 A. It's not contained in the report so I
23 suppose you would have to ask me.

24 Q. Okay. Do you have notes that reflect that
25 information?

1 A. I don't have notes. I have data. I have a
2 data file with their addresses.

3 Q. What format is that data file in?

4 A. An Excel spreadsheet.

5 Q. And that was provided to you by counsel?

6 A. It was.

7 Q. Why was the incumbent address information
8 important?

9 A. The incumbent address information was
10 important because we wanted to make sure that any
11 potential redistricting didn't take an incumbent
12 commissioner out of their district and perhaps pit
13 two incumbents against one another in a new
14 district.

15 Q. You also indicate on page 3 of your report
16 that you downloaded statewide election results from
17 Harvard's Dataverse; is that correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. What years did you download?

20 A. It was the governor's election, so I
21 believe that was 2018. But I'm not -- I can't -- I'm
22 not positive.

23 Q. Did you look at any other election results
24 for any other years?

25 A. I believe in my second report I refer to

1 the presidential election in 2020.

2 Q. Other than the governor's election or the
3 presidential election, did you look at any other
4 races in performing your analysis?

5 A. As I mentioned, Dr. Moy provided me
6 results for the 2020 county mayor race. I looked
7 very briefly at that.

8 Q. Okay. Other than these three races, did
9 you look at any other races?

10 A. I did not.

11 Q. What was important or probative about the
12 governor's 2018 race?

13 A. The governor's race was a partisan race
14 unlike the city commission elections. And there was
15 an alternative claim or argument to be made that the
16 districts were drawn in such a way as to bolster
17 partisan concerns. So by looking at an actual
18 partisan election I could show what evidence there
19 was for or against that.

20 Q. Would the same also be true for your
21 examination of the presidential election?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. What about for the mayoral race?

24 A. The county mayoral race or the mayoral
25 race?

1 Q. The county mayoral race.

2 A. Yes. Yes.

3 Q. Now, would you agree that partisanship is
4 closely aligned with ideology?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So that if there are politically
7 conservative commissioners, regardless of whether
8 they're Republicans or Democrats in a nonpartisan
9 race, that might be a factor in terms of how the
10 districts were drawn. Would you agree with that?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Why not?

13 A. Partisanship is a label that is used as a
14 cue for voters. It is a way to organize political
15 activity at the government and at the electoral
16 level. Ideology is an indication of a preference or
17 a policy and the type of policy that gets enacted
18 that is related to but not identical to
19 partisanship.

20 Q. Is it your position that commissioners
21 might not be in touch with their constituents to
22 understand the ideology that they hold regardless of
23 their partisan affiliations?

24 A. I'm sorry. Can you rephrase the question?

25 Q. Sure. Would you agree with the premise

1 that commissioners might have a good understanding
2 of the ideology of their constituents?

3 A. No. I can't speculate on that.

4 Q. So you have no idea whether city
5 commissioners may understand the ideology of their
6 constituents?

7 A. I have no idea.

8 Q. Okay. Did you examine any of the materials
9 that were provided in any of the elections that you
10 examined?

11 A. The material -- I don't know what
12 materials were provided you're referring to.

13 Q. You referenced that the city commission
14 races were nonpartisan. Correct?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Do you know if any of the candidates for
17 those races utilized language other than Republican
18 or Democrat that might be associated with Republican
19 or Democrat?

20 A. Are you referring to their campaigns?

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. No. I don't know anything about their
23 campaigns.

24 Q. So if any of the candidates ran on
25 antisocialist agendas, you wouldn't have any

1 knowledge of that. Correct?

2 A. No knowledge.

3 Q. Would you agree that an antisocialist
4 agenda would be associated with, generally speaking,
5 a Republican party?

6 A. I wouldn't -- I don't want to say -- no. I
7 don't agree with that necessarily.

8 Q. Okay. So it's your understanding that
9 Republican endorse socialism?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Are you aware of Republican candidates who
12 speak out against socialism?

13 A. None in particular. I couldn't give you
14 any names.

15 Q. But are you aware of whether that is
16 something that many Republican candidates often
17 speak against?

18 A. To the same extent Democrats do. I don't
19 have any distinction between the two.

20 Q. Now, you indicated that Dr. Moy provided
21 you with election results for the 2020 county mayor
22 race. Why was this information important to you?

23 A. I was also asked to take a look at -- if
24 it was helpful to me to also look at the county
25 mayor race.

1 Q. Was it helpful to you?

2 A. I didn't find it necessary.

3 Q. Have you ever drawn a redistricting plan?

4 A. For an official capacity?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. No.

7 Q. Have you ever drawn a redistricting plan
8 as an academic exercise?

9 A. Sure.

10 Q. How many times?

11 A. Oh, I couldn't tell you. I don't know.

12 Q. More than five?

13 A. Sure.

14 Q. More than ten?

15 A. I don't know the answer to this question.
16 Sorry.

17 Q. Before you commenced your analysis of the
18 city maps, did you do an analysis of the city's
19 population?

20 A. The size of the city and the size of the
21 districts? Population size?

22 Q. Sure. We'll start with population size.

23 A. Yes. I was asked to look at the size of
24 the city and the districts.

25 Q. Did you also look at the racial and ethnic

1 makeup of the districts?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Did you look at the racial and ethnic
4 makeup of the city as a whole?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you look at the racial and ethnic
7 makeup of where they live within the geographic
8 boundaries of the city?

9 A. Insofar as that I analyzed the districts
10 and the precincts and the blocks within the
11 district.

12 Q. When you're talking about your analysis of
13 the precincts and the blocks, were those only for
14 the areas that were moved or did you look at that
15 for the entire city area?

16 A. I did not look at precincts within the
17 core to the same extent. I looked at precincts on
18 the boundaries of the districts.

19 Q. When you were examining that information
20 related to the precincts and blocks related to the
21 core, did you look at the political performance of
22 those areas?

23 A. What do you mean by political performance?

24 Q. Whether they perform for a Republican or a
25 Democrat.

1 A. I looked at the districts as a whole. Yes.
2 The cores of the district.

3 Q. Did you review any of the transcripts in
4 this matter?

5 A. No. No.

6 Q. Are you able to summarize your opinions in
7 this case?

8 A. My conclusions?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. Sure. My conclusions were that precincts
11 and portions of precincts were moved with racial and
12 ethnic considerations in mind and that voters were
13 sorted into districts based on racial and ethnic
14 considerations.

15 Q. What were you told about the map drawing
16 process for the districts?

17 A. That the commission was responsible for
18 doing it. I was told that there was a three to two
19 final approval of the 2022 enjoined map. And I was
20 told that it was two Republican commissioners and
21 one democratic commissioner that voted the majority
22 for approval of the enjoined map -- the 2022
23 enjoined map.

24 Q. Do you know which two Republican
25 commissioners voted for the map?

1 A. I can't recall at this time.

2 Q. Do you recall which democratic
3 commissioner voted for the map?

4 A. I believe it was District 5's
5 commissioner.

6 Q. Do you know District 5's commissioner's
7 name?

8 A. I don't.

9 Q. Are you aware of whether the commission
10 hired outside attorneys and people with experience
11 in map drawing to draw the commission maps?

12 A. The only person I'm aware of is the
13 consultant -- consultant De Grandy.

14 Q. And how are you aware of Mr. De Grandy?

15 A. I was given versions of his map that was
16 presented to the commission.

17 Q. Did you read any of Mr. De Grandy's
18 comments about his presentation of either the 2022
19 plan or the 2023 plan?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Would that information be important to you
22 in forming your opinions?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Why not?

25 A. I have the data. I don't need -- I don't

1 need any additional comments.

2 Q. So is it -- I just want to be clear. Is it
3 your position that the data tells the entire story?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So if there are other alternative
6 explanations as to why a line was moved, those would
7 be irrelevant for the purposes of your analysis; is
8 that correct?

9 A. It depends -- it depends on the
10 alternative explanation, but if -- if it can be
11 shown to be an inadequate explanation based on the
12 data, then that's all I need.

13 Q. But at this point the only alternative
14 explanations are the ones that are relayed to you by
15 counsel; is that correct?

16 A. The ones that I -- I list in my report.

17 Q. Did you review or analyze any of the
18 plaintiffs' plans that were presented?

19 A. No. I was given a map if I wanted to look
20 at it, but I did not review or discuss it in my
21 report.

22 Q. Do you recall which plan it was?

23 A. It was after the second -- it was when I
24 was writing my second report. So it was after the --
25 after the '22 enjoined plan. I don't know exactly

1 which map. There was a lot of maps.

2 Q. Were you aware that plaintiffs have
3 proposed four alternative plans in this litigation?

4 A. I was not.

5 Q. If I could ask you to flip back to page 1
6 of your report. Your introductory sentence says, the
7 enacted Miami city commission districting plan is
8 the byproduct of many decades of racialized
9 commission maps.

10 What is your basis for that statement?

11 A. I was given the 2003 map and the 1997 map,
12 I believe it was. And they look, at first glance,
13 quite similar to the 2013 map and to the enjoined
14 2022 map.

15 Q. Okay. But I guess -- you're making the
16 statement here that the commission maps are decades
17 of racialized commission maps as a starting point.
18 What is your basis for concluding that the
19 commission maps were racialized as a starting point?

20 A. The cores. The districts as they have
21 existed for many decades have not changed
22 significantly except for pieces on the border. The
23 portions that have not changed have continued to be
24 highly segregated based on race and ethnicity.

25 Q. In your mind, is that improper?

1 A. I have no opinion on that.

2 Q. So just to be clear, you don't have an
3 opinion on whether the historic maps from 1997
4 through 2013 considered -- improperly considered
5 race in the drawing of those maps?

6 A. I cannot say anything about proper or
7 improper.

8 Q. Okay. So you're just observing that from
9 1997 through 2013 there were maps that had five
10 districts, three of which would likely reliably
11 elect a Hispanic candidate and one of which would
12 reliably elect a Black candidate? Would that be --

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. And that same conclusion would be true for
15 the 2022 plan. Correct?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And the 2023 plan?

18 A. Is that the proposed remedy which is the
19 2023 plan you're referring to?

20 Q. Yes. So -- I'll try to refer to the plans
21 that the City passed by the year that they were
22 enacted. So we've got 1997, 2003, 2013, 2022, and
23 2023 for the plans.

24 A. So the proposed --

25 Q. Sorry. Go ahead.

1 A. The proposed remedy was passed then?

2 That's currently enacted? I don't know.

3 Q. Have you examined the 2023 plan?

4 A. As the proposed remedy, yes, I have in my
5 second report.

6 Q. On page 2 of your report -- let me back
7 up. Going back to page 1, in the first paragraph,
8 second sentence you state, changes made from the
9 2013 enacted plan are also racially motivated,
10 though these changes are minimal compared to the
11 inherited racialization from previous plans. You
12 state that they were minimal.

13 How did you measure that?

14 A. I looked at the overall change to the
15 districts.

16 Q. Would you agree that the overall change to
17 the districts was not significant?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Do you have any opinions on how the city
20 plan could have or should have been drawn?

21 A. Only to the extent of what I outline in my
22 report that there were alternative precincts and
23 portions of precincts that could have been moved
24 instead of the ones that were moved.

25 Q. On page 2 you state, based on my

1 examination I reached the conclusion that areas
2 moved from one district to another were done so on
3 the basis of race and that other areas could have
4 been moved without further segregating the districts
5 by race.

6 Is it your opinion that there were moves
7 that further segregated the districts by race?

8 A. There were moves that exacerbated the
9 situation, yes.

10 Q. When you say exacerbated, does that mean
11 it made them more or less segregated?

12 A. More segregated.

13 Q. And how would you measure that?

14 A. I looked at the precincts that were moved
15 compared to the precincts that were not moved that
16 were nearby.

17 Q. From a quantifying standpoint how does
18 that translate to the 2020 plan district numbers?

19 A. The 2020 plan? Which is the 2020 plan?

20 Q. I'm sorry. 2022.

21 A. Okay. Sorry. Can you repeat the question?

22 Q. Sure. If you were to quantify that
23 exacerbation, how is that going to be reflected in
24 the 2022 plan numbers?

25 A. You have to compare what the

1 hypothetical -- the counter possibility was and if
2 you compare it to what could have been moved versus
3 what was moved -- because there had to have been
4 changes because of population equality reasons.
5 Right? There had to be changes made. The changes
6 that were made compared to the changes that could
7 have been made made the districts more segregated
8 than they otherwise would have been.

9 Q. Did you draw any comparisons related to
10 the changes that were made to the benchmark
11 districts?

12 A. Can you repeat the question?

13 Q. Did you draw any conclusions related to
14 the changes that were made benchmark districts? And
15 when I refer to the benchmark districts I'm
16 referring to the 2013 plan.

17 A. Sorry. Draw any conclusions about changes
18 that were made to the 2013 districts. I mean, my
19 conclusions were that the changes were made based on
20 racial and ethnic considerations.

21 Q. Would you agree that if the three Hispanic
22 districts were drawn in such a way that the Hispanic
23 voting age population dropped in each of those
24 districts, that that undercuts the idea that the
25 districts were racially exacerbated?

1 A. I don't understand the question. Can you
2 repeat it, please?

3 Q. We'll move along. I think it might help
4 when we start getting into some of the examples. In
5 that paragraph you say, I also have observed the
6 commission's practice of splitting precincts along
7 racial lines.

8 What is your basis for that statement?

9 A. The basis for my statement is that
10 precincts were split and the ones that remained in
11 districts versus the ones that were moved into new
12 districts looked different in terms of their race.
13 Each split looked different.

14 Q. Do you know if the map drawers paid
15 attention to precincts when they were drawing the
16 map?

17 A. I don't know.

18 Q. If they'd completely ignored precincts
19 because the new map would be re-precincted [sic],
20 does that change your opinion as to their
21 motivation?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Is it your belief that they intentionally
24 considered the splitting of precincts as they were
25 drawing the plan?

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. If I could ask you to flip to the bottom
3 of page 3. There you say that City of Miami had
4 inherited districts maps from 2013 and beyond that
5 exhibited clear patterns of racial segregation.

6 What is your understanding of how the
7 Voting Rights Act might apply to the city's
8 districts?

9 A. I don't know.

10 Q. Are you familiar with the Voting Rights
11 Act?

12 A. I have heard of it. Yes.

13 Q. Are you aware of whether the Voting Rights
14 Act requires there to be a district that will
15 perform for a Black candidate based upon the city's
16 ethnic and racial makeup?

17 A. I'm not a lawyer. I don't know the
18 specifics.

19 Q. Well, wouldn't whether a district needs to
20 be drawn in such a way so that it performs for a
21 Black candidate be relevant for your opinions?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Why not?

24 A. That wasn't what I was asked to do.

25 Q. So if the law requires that the district

1 be drawn in such a way that it performs for a Black
2 candidate which would necessarily require the
3 consideration of whether there's a sufficient Black
4 population in the district, that wouldn't be
5 relevant for your analysis that examined race?

6 A. I wasn't asked to take that into
7 consideration.

8 Q. On page 4 you state, majorities tend to be
9 exaggerated in districts and identified Districts 1,
10 3, and 4 for Hispanics and District 5 for Black
11 voters.

12 Are you aware of other ways the districts
13 could be drawn that would not exaggerate the
14 minority -- I'm sorry -- the minorities in those
15 districts?

16 A. I don't know.

17 Q. That's not something that you explored?

18 A. It wasn't what I was asked to do.

19 Q. Are you aware of what the Hispanic voting
20 age population is for the city of Miami?

21 A. I'm not.

22 Q. Are you aware of what the Black voting age
23 population is for the city of Miami?

24 A. I believe it was 15 percent.

25 Q. In paragraph 4 of your report, you state,

1 only one district, District 5, had equal or greater
2 Black VAP under the 2013 plan.

3 What are your referring to there?

4 A. Sorry. Which page are you on?

5 Q. Page 4.

6 A. Yeah. I see it. Okay. What am I referring
7 to in that sentence?

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. That District 5 was the only district that
10 had equal or greater than 14.8 percent Black VAP.

11 Q. Do you know what it was in the 2013 plan?

12 A. Do I know what what was in the 2013 plan?

13 Q. What the Black VAP is in the 2013 plan?

14 A. For the city?

15 Q. For District 5.

16 A. 52.9 percent.

17 Q. Do you know what the Black VAP was in the
18 2022 plan for District 5?

19 A. 15.3 percent.

20 Q. So at least in terms of drawing that new
21 district for the 2022 plan, the Black VAP decreased.
22 Correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And if the Black VAP decreased from the
25 2013 plan, that didn't exacerbate the racial

1 segregation, did it?

2 A. Again, it depends upon what you're
3 comparing it to. You can't compare it to the 2013
4 plan; you have to compare it to what needed to be
5 changed because of population reasons.

6 Q. Well, is there a predetermined change that
7 needs to occur for population reasons?

8 A. You needed to decrease the size of
9 District 2.

10 Q. And how overpopulated was District 2?

11 A. Under the 2013 plan there were 117,281
12 individuals compared to the other districts that had
13 somewhere between 80- and 83,000 people.

14 Q. And District 5 needed to gain population.
15 Correct?

16 A. It was the second largest so it could have
17 gained some or it could not have gained some, but
18 District 2 needed to decrease.

19 Q. You'd mentioned that the proper comparison
20 is not to the 2013 benchmark, but to the
21 alternatives that could have been considered. Why is
22 that?

23 A. Because the 2013 plan couldn't remain as
24 it was.

25 Q. But why wouldn't the 2013 plan be a proper

1 comparator if you were utilizing the cores of
2 existing districts?

3 A. The changes that were made needed to be
4 compared to other possible changes. There was no
5 version of the world in which you could have had the
6 exact same map in 2013.

7 Q. I understand. I guess where I'm going at
8 is, why does it have to be alternative options to
9 what they considered versus we start from the
10 benchmark, that's the plan that we need to change,
11 we have a preset racial makeup, and you compare
12 it -- is it making it more racially segregated from
13 the 2013 plan or less racially segregated from the
14 2013 plan? Why would that not be a proper analysis?

15 A. Because I reject the idea that the 2013
16 plan is something to compare a new plan to when you
17 cannot have the 2013 plan in 2022.

18 Q. Are you aware of whether courts examined
19 the benchmark plan to assess what needs to be done
20 or whether a replacement plan is sufficient for
21 legal reasons?

22 A. No. I am not aware.

23 Q. Did counsel for plaintiffs direct you to
24 not make comparisons to the benchmark plan?

25 A. No.

1 Q. On page 5, the last full paragraph at the
2 bottom of that page, in the third sentence -- I'll
3 go ahead and read for completeness. You reference
4 Table 3 depicts the racial VAP composition after
5 redistricting. And that sets up your comparison
6 that you're comparing the 2022 plan to the 2013
7 plan. Correct?

8 A. I don't know if it sets up the comparison.
9 It's a list of -- it's a description.

10 Q. Okay. The second sentence, overall Black
11 VAP in District 2 decreased slightly as a percentage
12 total of VAP from 7.7 to 7.2 percent as did Hispanic
13 VAP from 52 percent to 49 percent after
14 redistricting.

15 Are you comparing the 2022 plan with the
16 2013 plan in that sentence?

17 A. I'm comparing the -- I'm comparing the
18 Black and Hispanic VAP from the 2013 plan in
19 District 2 to the 2022 plan in District 2.

20 Q. And then you say, this was due to the fact
21 that white VAP increased from 34 percent to
22 37 percent after redistricting.

23 From a geographic standpoint, do you know
24 where those white voters lived?

25 A. No, I don't.

1 Q. Did you do any analysis of where -- strike
2 that.

3 Did you do any analysis of whether there
4 were concentrated areas of minority population?

5 A. In District 2?

6 Q. Anywhere in the map.

7 A. No. I don't -- I don't know specifically.
8 I mean, I looked at -- I looked at individual
9 precincts and if I go back and look at my data I can
10 tell you if I looked where, but yes.

11 Q. But that's not something that you've done
12 to date in terms of looking at the map as a whole to
13 figure out where there might be concentrations of
14 minority voters?

15 A. I looked at portions of districts and
16 precincts to see the racial composition of those
17 areas.

18 Q. But just for those precincts along the
19 borders. Correct?

20 A. I did not, generally speaking, look at
21 individual precincts within the cores of the
22 districts, the internal portions of the district.

23 Q. Okay. So in the next sentence you state,
24 on the whole, however, there was no statistical
25 difference between voting age population or VAP by

1 race before and after redistricting at the district
2 level.

3 If I understand that correctly, that means
4 that even though they redrew these districts, there
5 is still going to be three Hispanic districts, a
6 Black district, and a plurality district. Correct?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And your examination goes to a more
9 granular level to do that data analysis. Is my
10 understanding there correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Now, jumping into your analysis made
13 between the changes for the 2013 and 2022 plan,
14 starting with District 1. You would agree that
15 District 1 had to gain population. Correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Do you know if District 1 assumes
18 District 2?

19 A. It does not.

20 Q. Okay. And in responding to that question,
21 what are you referring to that is in front of you?

22 A. My expert report.

23 Q. Is that the only thing that you have in
24 front of you at this time?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Do you also have a computer in front of
2 you?

3 A. I do not.

4 Q. Okay. Is there a tablet?

5 MR. MERKEN: George, that's the
6 controls for the video screen.

7 MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you, Chris. I
8 was wondering what that was.

9 MR. MERKEN: It's just the Zoom
10 controls.

11 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

12 Q. So if District 1 needed to gain
13 population, how would it get population as part of
14 the map drawing process?

15 A. District 2 has to give precincts or areas
16 of the district to the joining -- the districts that
17 it touches, so District 5, 3, and 4 and then those
18 districts have to give portions of their district to
19 District 1, which they all touch.

20 Q. So for the purposes of the city
21 commission's work, District 2 could shed population
22 theoretically to one district and then you could
23 rotate the population all the way around or it could
24 give a little bit to all three districts and some
25 variation of those three districts would need to

1 donate to District 1. Is that fair?

2 A. That sounds right.

3 Q. And there are lots of different ways that
4 the commission could make those population
5 adjustments; would you agree?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. From a race and ethnicity standpoint, what
8 is the makeup of District 1?

9 A. Just generally speaking?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. It's a Hispanic super majority district.

12 Q. On that same page you say, the changes
13 under the 2022 enacted plan resulted in District 1
14 growing both in absolute and relative terms. And
15 you indicated is now the second largest district
16 after District 2.

17 What is the significance of that to you
18 for your analysis?

19 A. It just means that it gained more
20 population than maybe it absolutely needed to if you
21 want to keep the rank ordering of the districts the
22 same.

23 Q. Are you aware of anything that would
24 require one to keep the rank ordering of the
25 districts the same?

1 A. No. No.

2 Q. Is there anything in your opinions that
3 suggests that not keeping the rank ordering is
4 problematic?

5 A. No.

6 Q. In the next paragraph you say, changes
7 made to District 1 occurred in tandem with changes
8 only to District 5.

9 Is that problematic?

10 A. No. Not in and of itself.

11 Q. If we could scroll down to Table 4. And I
12 think this reflects your analysis of the precincts;
13 is that correct?

14 A. These are splits, precincts splits.

15 Q. Okay. Are you aware of anything that
16 requires a map drawer to use precincts when drawing
17 plans?

18 A. No.

19 Q. If the city was going to be re-precincted
20 [sic] as part of the 2020 census process, do you
21 think it would still be important for the map drawer
22 to utilize precincts in drawing?

23 A. I don't know.

24 Q. If the city map drawer ignored precincts,
25 is that problematic to you?

1 A. If he did so in a uniform way, probably
2 not.

3 Q. When you say in a uniform way, can you
4 explain that?

5 A. If all of the portions that were moved
6 were completely split and every -- in every way,
7 every time there was a move, I would say that would
8 be evidence that they did not take into account
9 precincts when they moved. The portions of the
10 district.

11 Q. And what would be something that would
12 indicate that they didn't do it in a uniform way?

13 A. If they split districts -- if they split
14 precincts sometimes and didn't split precincts other
15 times.

16 Q. And there is no chance that that could be
17 explained simply by where they were drawing the
18 district lines and where the precinct lines fall?

19 A. I don't know. I didn't look at that.

20 Q. So in looking at your Table 4, if I
21 understand correctly, you've got a District 1 split
22 column and a District 5 split column. Does that
23 indicate which precincts were placed into which
24 districts?

25 A. Yeah. Some of them remained in those

1 districts, some of them were moved. But after --
2 under the 2022 enacted plan, the District 1 split
3 column are splits that remained or were moved into
4 District 1 and the District 5 split column were
5 precinct splits that were either moved into
6 District 5 or remained in District 5.

7 Q. Okay. And looking at Precinct 531 for
8 District 1, in Area 6, 27.2 percent Black population
9 either remained or was moved into District 1. Would
10 that have increased or decreased the BVAP in
11 District 1?

12 A. I don't know. It depends on the other
13 changes that were made.

14 Q. Well, that change by itself, do you know
15 if 27.2 percent is higher or lower than the existing
16 percentage for District 1?

17 A. It's higher.

18 Q. So that would have a tendency to increase
19 the BVAP in District 1. Correct?

20 A. Again, it depends on what other changes
21 you make.

22 Q. Sure. But in a vacuum, 27.2 percent higher
23 than the current BVAP in District 1, that would have
24 the effect of increasing it if all other things
25 remained equal. Correct?

1 A. 27.2 percent Black VAP is higher than the
2 District 1 Black VAP under the 2013 plan. But as
3 I've said, other changes need to be made. So none of
4 this could have happened in a vacuum.

5 Q. And we'll go through the rest of the
6 changes. I just want to make sure we're
7 understanding what's going on with both the district
8 drawing and your analysis.

9 The second figure, 44.9 percent represents
10 white voting age population. Correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. And all other things being equal, 44.9
13 percent would have boosted the white voting age
14 population in District 1. Correct?

15 A. 44.9 percent white VAP is higher than the
16 white VAP in District 1 under the 2013 plan.

17 Q. And 71.1 percent is lower -- well, let me
18 back up. I'm getting ahead of myself.

19 71.1 percent is referring to the Hispanic
20 voting age population in Precinct 531 that is either
21 kept or moved into District 1. Correct?

22 A. Yes. Correct.

23 Q. And that is lower than the existing
24 Hispanic voting age population in District 1.
25 Correct?

1 A. Under the 2013 plan. Correct.

2 Q. And under the 2022 plan.

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Now, you used percentages here. Do you
5 know how many voters were in Precinct 531 that we're
6 talking about?

7 A. I do not have the total population for
8 531. No.

9 Q. For any of your precinct analyses in your
10 first report, do you list the number of voters that
11 are impacted by the move?

12 A. I do have some of this in the appendix.

13 Q. And is that the table that begins on
14 page 25?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And you've got a series of tables there
17 that begin on 25 and run to page 29?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. Looking at Precinct 523 for District 1,
20 27.4 percent would be a higher Black voting age
21 population than what was included in the 2024 plan.
22 I'm sorry. 2022 plan. Correct?

23 A. For which district?

24 Q. For District 1.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And looking at Precinct 529, 18.7 percent
2 would be a higher Black voting age population than
3 what is included in District 1 in the 2022 plan.
4 Correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And the same would also be true for
7 Precincts 512 and 522?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. So every single precinct there would have
10 boosted the Black voting age population in a
11 Hispanic district. Correct?

12 A. Those areas that were moved had higher
13 Black VAP than the district that they were moved
14 into under the 2013 and 2022 plan.

15 Q. So those changes, then, would not have
16 exacerbated the racial segregation in comparison to
17 the 2013 benchmark. Is that fair?

18 A. Those changes were not made in a vacuum.
19 So, as I've said, I am not comparing what could have
20 been made -- what was made to the 2013 plan. I'm
21 comparing what was made to the 2013 plan in
22 comparison to what could have been made to the 2013
23 plan.

24 Q. Well, certainly they could have placed
25 those areas for that Black population in District 5

1 to further boost the Black population in District 5,
2 couldn't they?

3 A. District 5 had to get rid of population if
4 they were being given more population by District 2.
5 As I note in my report, District 5 gave some areas
6 to District 1 and then District 1 turned around and
7 gave some areas to District 5. So it wasn't -- they
8 weren't even a net donor. They interchanged areas.

9 Q. I guess my question is, if they were doing
10 it for racial reasons, wouldn't you expect that if
11 District 1 was looking to shed Black voters and
12 boost Hispanic voters, wouldn't you expect the BVAP
13 that is being shifted to District 1 to be lower than
14 what is reflected?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Why not?

17 A. Because they had to change their map and
18 they had to change it in such a way that they were
19 using areas of the city that were on their border.
20 So they had to find areas that may not have had as
21 low Black population as the core or lower than the
22 core.

23 Q. What are the areas that could have been
24 moved for District 1 that would -- let me back up.

25 Regarding the changes to District 1, how

1 was race a factor?

2 A. I don't understand. Can you clarify the
3 question?

4 Q. Sure. Based upon your analysis of the
5 data, you've reached conclusions about what was done
6 to District 1 and why it was done to District 1. So
7 my question is, what precisely was done to
8 District 1 and why was it done?

9 A. District 1 took on areas from District 5
10 that were lower in Black population, Black VAP, than
11 other areas that remained in District 5. And that's
12 why I have these splits in this table to show you
13 that precincts -- I'm using as the unit of analysis
14 here because it's a -- we know that that area is
15 close together -- the splits are very close to one
16 another because they're contained in the same
17 precinct. So there was a decision -- for instance,
18 for Precinct 531 there was a decision to take that
19 portion of that area into District 1 rather than the
20 part that remained or was moved into District 5
21 which had a higher Black population, higher Black
22 VAP.

23 Q. Okay. But that's not necessarily true for
24 all of the precincts, is it?

25 A. I looked at all of the precincts that were

1 moved.

2 Q. Okay. Let's look at Precinct 529.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. There is a percentage -- 18.7 percent was
5 moved to District 1 or stayed in District 1 whereas
6 for District 5, 13.3 percent Black voting age
7 population either stayed or was moved to District 5.

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. That's inconsistent with the narrative
10 that Black voting age population was boosted in
11 District 5 and Hispanic population was boosted in
12 District 1, isn't it?

13 A. This is -- 529 is one district where the
14 splits do not reflect the pattern I am referring to.
15 It is a small difference, 18.7 percent Black VAP
16 compared to 13.3 percent Black VAP. So a 5.4
17 percentage point difference compared to some of
18 these other precincts where the difference in
19 percentage points is almost 40 percentage points.

20 MR. MERKEN: George, can we take a
21 quick five-minute break when you're at a
22 good place. It's been about 90 minutes.

23 MR. LEVESQUE: Sure. We'll take a
24 break now. It's 10:30. Let's be back at
25 10:35.

1 (Recess in proceedings.)

2 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

3 Q. Dr. Abbott, going back to page 7 of your
4 report analyzing the 2022 plan, Table 4, you've
5 identified five precincts where you have identified
6 where the decisions were made deliberately on the
7 basis of race. Do I understand what is supposed to
8 be reflected in that report?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Did you examine all of the precincts that
11 were swapped between D-5 and D-1?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Are these the only five that you
14 identified where that was going on?

15 A. If those were the only ones listed then I
16 believe those were the -- those were the areas that
17 were moved.

18 Q. Okay. And if I can refer you to page 25
19 and 26 where in the area description we're talking
20 about areas that were moved from D-5 to D-1 starting
21 on page 25 first. About halfway down you've got
22 Riverside there moved from D-5 to D-1.

23 A. This is -- this is the February 7th draft.

24 Q. Okay. So is the draft -- if we wanted to
25 look at the 2022 enacted plan we should be looking

1 at the report starting on page 26?

2 A. That's comparison of the February 7th
3 drafted to the enacted plan.

4 Q. Okay. So if we wanted to do a comparison,
5 then, of the benchmark plan, the 2013 plan to the
6 enacted plan, the '22 plan, we should look at
7 page 27?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And so that plan also moved Precinct 530.
10 Correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And that's not one that you identified as
13 being racially problematic. Correct?

14 A. Table 4 looks at just precincts that were
15 split. Just areas that were split. I used the
16 split -- I used the split precincts as a way to look
17 at areas that were very close to one another that
18 were in a preexisting geographical unit, although I
19 don't know if that's relevant, but they were areas
20 that were very close to one another. And reasonably
21 good comparisons to make with one another. If you
22 look at whole precincts you can compare any other
23 precinct on the border as an option. These were
24 areas that had natural comparisons that I wanted to
25 make.

1 Q. Well, and I guess my question is, in
2 looking at the list of precincts that were moved
3 from D-5 to D-1, the only one that is identified in
4 your Table 4 that was actually moved from D-5 to
5 D-1 is 531; is that correct?

6 A. No. The first row of the table are areas
7 that were moved from D-5 to D-1 as well. So the
8 precinct splits at 512 and 522.

9 Q. Okay. So all together there were three
10 precincts that were moved from D-5 to D-1 that are
11 detailed in your table?

12 A. They were not moved wholly. These were
13 three precincts that were split that D-5 took on
14 from D-1.

15 Q. But the precincts that were split in 529
16 and 523 in Table 4, those were areas that were
17 already in D-1. Correct?

18 A. Correct. The split was moved into D-5.

19 Q. Dr. Abott, I'm going to try and share my
20 screen here. Are you able to see that document?

21 A. I can see it. I can't -- I don't think I
22 can read it that well. My eyes aren't the best,
23 but --

24 Q. Let me see if I can enlarge it here. Is
25 that helpful?

1 A. Yeah. You have to scroll down for me to
2 see the whole thing. But yeah.

3 Q. And I'm going to represent to you that
4 this is Resolution R21-0485 that the city commission
5 adopted providing directions to its map drawers on
6 how they should rank criteria and address their map
7 drawing duties.

8 Are you able to read that criteria?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Was this information conveyed to you in
11 terms of how the city instructed its map drawers to
12 go about drawing maps?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Do you see anything on there that reflects
15 compactness?

16 A. Maybe E, but I don't know.

17 Q. Where it says maintain communities of
18 interest in neighborhoods where feasible?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Is it your understanding that that's the
21 functional equivalent of compactness in
22 redistricting parlance?

23 A. No.

24 Q. That would be two different things.
25 Correct?

1 A. Sorry?

2 Q. That would -- those would be two different
3 things. Correct?

4 A. The way I understand it, yes.

5 Q. Were you aware that the city commission
6 rejected compactness as a redistricting criteria?

7 A. I was not aware.

8 Q. If the city commission directed its map
9 drawers to not worry about compactness when drawing
10 district lines, but to factor in normal things like
11 voter cohesion or maintaining the core of existing
12 districts, are those decision points that would
13 impact any of your opinions?

14 A. No.

15 Q. On page 7 of your report underneath Table
16 4 you indicated that the areas that were chosen were
17 deliberately done on the basis of race. Is that
18 statement in reference to the precinct splits that
19 were -- that you describe above?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You would agree, though, that there were
22 other -- I'm sorry. You would agree that there were
23 other changes that were made that were not
24 necessarily reflected in those particular precincts.
25 Correct?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. So what is reflected there are just the
3 precincts where you were able to identify race as a
4 factor in the changes. Is that fair?

5 A. What's reflected here are areas that to my
6 political scientist mind represent good comparisons
7 and good counter hypotheticals for what could have
8 been done versus what was done.

9 Q. Well, you used an interesting description
10 there. Counter hypotheticals for what could have
11 been done. What other things for District 1 could
12 have been done that would not have taken race into
13 account?

14 A. There were other precincts or other
15 portions of precincts that could have been moved
16 that had different breakdowns of race and ethnicity
17 that would have not been as -- the degree of -- the
18 size of the Black VAP would have been lower, for
19 instance, in other places that could have remained
20 in District 5.

21 Q. Okay. We're talking about District 1,
22 though, right now.

23 A. Right. So areas that had higher Black VAP
24 than the ones that were moved into District 1.

25 Q. Well, all of the areas -- all of the

1 precinct areas that we've identified there all had
2 higher Black voting age population than what was
3 reflected in District 1. Correct?

4 A. Correct. But they did not have higher
5 Black VAP compared to other possible precincts that
6 could have been moved in.

7 Q. And I guess what -- did you identify what
8 those area possible precincts are in your report?

9 A. In this table it looks at the other half
10 for the other portion of the precinct that was not
11 moved.

12 Q. So if I understand correctly, then, the
13 argument is that it could have incorporated some of
14 those other precincts. From a map drawing process,
15 did you look at where those precincts were
16 geographically in relation to the precincts that
17 weren't moved?

18 A. They were all on the border. Right? You
19 had to find areas that were on the border of these
20 districts. So I looked at other precincts or
21 precinct splits that were also on the borders.

22 Q. Well, let's look at Area 8 of your report.
23 I'm going to put it up on the screen if I can. Are
24 you able to see that?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. So we've got Precincts 512 and 522
2 in Area 8. When we look at Area 8 that is in
3 question here, are you able to see that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Geographically in that area, do you know
6 where Precincts 512 and 522 are located?

7 A. I couldn't tell you from this map.

8 Q. Did you look at whether the precincts that
9 you were comparing are reflected geographically such
10 that where the City drew the line your precinct with
11 a higher Black voting age population would be in the
12 yellow portion or the blue portion or purple?

13 A. The area with the higher Black population
14 remained in the yellow portion, which is District 5.

15 Q. So if it wanted to include that portion,
16 it would need to go further into District 5.
17 Correct?

18 A. Not necessarily. It could have gone to the
19 right. To the east.

20 Q. Did you do analysis of that block to the
21 east?

22 A. It's not in the report.

23 Q. Do you know if the areas of Precincts
24 512 or 522 are to the east?

25 A. I'm sorry?

1 Q. Do you know --

2 A. Say it again.

3 Q. Do you know if the areas of Precincts 512
4 and 522 are to the east?

5 A. I don't. I don't. They might be. I don't.

6 Q. From a redistricting standpoint, is there
7 anything unusual about the way those lines were
8 drawn, in your opinion?

9 A. Probably decreases a little bit of
10 compactness the way they were drawn.

11 Q. But that wouldn't be a problem if the city
12 commission decided not to use compactness as a
13 measure that it was going to observe. Correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. At the bottom of page 8 and the top of
16 page 9 of your report it indicates three areas that
17 were moved from District 2 stand out. The first area
18 is 10 and 11 that was given to District 5. This
19 section of donated precincts had a lower white
20 voting age population, a greater Hispanic and Black
21 VAP compared to the areas that were not moved.

22 What is the significance of that
23 observation?

24 A. The significance is that areas that were
25 moved compared to areas that weren't moved shored up

1 preexisting breakdowns of race in the districts.

2 Q. Do you recall what the Hispanic population
3 in that district was in District 2 in the 2013 plan?

4 A. 51.9 percent.

5 Q. And after the 2022 plan was enacted it was
6 less than that. Correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Is that a statistically -- I'm sorry. What
9 was the percentage difference between 2013 and 2022?

10 A. 2013 was 51.9 percent, 2022 was
11 48.6 percent.

12 Q. Is that a statistically different drop for
13 that district?

14 A. I don't know.

15 Q. Were you asked to reach an opinion whether
16 that was a statistically significant drop?

17 A. No.

18 Q. And if I understood some of our earlier
19 dialogue, when it comes to race and ethnicity on a
20 map-wide basis for each district, there are not
21 statistically significant changes that were made to
22 the map. Correct?

23 A. Across all five districts.

24 Q. What about in relation to any particular
25 district?

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. Now, the areas of the map that we're
3 talking about, Area 10 and 11 -- bring that back up.
4 Are you able to see that?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. What is your understanding of what is
7 going on with this geography in terms of housing?
8 What's there? Do you know?

9 A. I have no idea. I don't know.

10 Q. In terms of the map as a whole, do you
11 have any understanding of where the white voting age
12 population resides?

13 A. In District 2 for the plurality of them.

14 Q. So are you aware that District 2 is a
15 district that primarily runs along the coast?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. What is your understanding of where the
18 Hispanic population is largely concentrated?

19 A. Districts 1, 3, and 4.

20 Q. And so those would be the inland areas of
21 the city boundaries. Correct?

22 A. One and 4 are on the city boundaries.
23 District 3 is not on city boundaries inland. Or on
24 the coast either.

25 Q. What areas of District 2. Did you

1 identify that could have been shifted to District 5
2 that did not have a problematic racial makeup?

3 A. There were two split precincts I list
4 here, precinct 534-A and 536-A. The split precincts
5 that were given to District 5 had higher Black VAP
6 than the portions that remained in District 2. It's
7 broken down in district -- broken down in Table 5.

8 Q. And looking at that map are you able to
9 identify where those districts -- I'm sorry. Where
10 the precincts would be?

11 A. I don't recall.

12 Q. At any point when you were doing your
13 precinct analyses did you drill down to the
14 geography to figure out where they were located?

15 A. Yeah. Using the shape files. The maps.

16 Q. So if a precinct -- let's say in that
17 example there is a precinct that you were drawing a
18 comparison with for 534 or 536-A that was closer to
19 what is the old district line for District 2, did
20 that weigh into your analysis at all about whether
21 you could give as much credence to the racial
22 disparity?

23 A. I primarily looked at the splits -- the
24 precinct splits. Just look at areas that were split
25 amongst District 2 and District 5 that were

1 traditionally geographic units, preexisting
2 geographic units, and compared what those areas
3 looked like before and after the split.

4 Q. So you looked at the data, you didn't
5 necessarily take into account the geography or any
6 of the other information that might be impacting
7 where the City was drawing the line. Is that fair?

8 A. I don't know what specifically you mean by
9 geography, but I was not taking into account
10 anything other than the data and the maps.

11 Q. I guess, Doctor, let me ask it this way.
12 In this area of 10 and 11, what is your
13 understanding -- or do you have any understanding of
14 where white population might live within those
15 borders and where the Black population might live
16 within those borders?

17 A. No. Not at the block level. No, I don't.

18 Q. Would that be important to know as part of
19 your analysis?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Why not?

22 A. I don't see how it would impact my
23 conclusions or my analyses.

24 Q. Well, if one of the precincts that
25 reflects the racial disparity you're referencing is,

1 say, located along this boundary (indicating), and
2 they're capturing all of the area outside of that,
3 they can't very well carve that out and put it into
4 District 2 to maintain that, could they?

5 A. Can you rephrase that? I don't know who
6 they is that you're referring to.

7 Q. Whoever is drawing the map. If someone is
8 drawing a map and they're going to take this entire
9 area (indicating), and let's say Precinct 534-A,
10 hypothetically speaking, were somewhere along this
11 area (indicating), they're capturing the areas on
12 the outside or at the top to make a clean line,
13 those are all decisions that might reduce or
14 otherwise explain why there's a racial disparity
15 there. Correct?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Why not?

18 A. They're taking -- they're taking portions
19 of the precinct. The other portion of the precinct
20 is contiguous -- geographically contiguous with the
21 other half of the precinct.

22 Q. But do you know which way the precincts
23 are running?

24 A. Not off the top of my head.

25 Q. Did you examine whether any of these

1 boundaries were following major roadways?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay. I want to shift down to Area 13. Is
4 it your opinion that the racial disparities in the
5 precinct splits there explain why that area was
6 drawn that way?

7 A. No.

8 Q. What is your opinion concerning Area 13?

9 A. My opinion is that because the precincts
10 do not differ by race that there were other
11 considerations for why that area was moved. But
12 because that area was moved other areas needed to be
13 moved as well.

14 Q. Is it your conclusion that that area was
15 drawn so that they could move other areas?

16 A. No. I don't know. I don't have -- I don't
17 know the motivations.

18 Q. Did anyone ever inform you that at the
19 very lowest point of that Area 13 in that general
20 area where my cursor is (indicating), that that is
21 where one of the city commissioners maintains a
22 residence?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And what is your understanding of that?

25 A. My understanding is that the commissioner

1 had two homes, one of which was in District 3 and
2 the other one was not.

3 Q. Did anyone ever inform you that that area
4 was drawn so that his other residence would be
5 included in District 3?

6 A. No.

7 Q. You indicated earlier that there were news
8 reports that you had reviewed based upon your
9 research. What were those news reports?

10 A. News reports were about the politics and
11 the process and the conflict over the new maps or
12 the map drawing process, I suppose.

13 Q. Okay. Were those related to the map
14 drawing process that was commenced in 2022?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Did the news reports also cover the map
17 drawing process that was done in 2023?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Did it cover any of the prior map drawing
20 processes, whether it be '97, 2003, or 2013?

21 A. No.

22 Q. In 2022, how did it describe the politics?

23 A. They mentioned the commissioner's second
24 home. That seemed to be one of the biggest stories
25 that were mentioned. And that they were having

1 trouble coming up with a consensus about a map.

2 Q. Did the article also cover other
3 circumstances as to why the commissioner might want
4 his second home in his district?

5 A. I don't know. I don't know in particular.

6 Q. Do you recall if you read that news story
7 before or after you finalized your first report in
8 this matter?

9 A. Before.

10 Q. Is there a reason you did not include that
11 in your report?

12 A. I couldn't speculate on motivation.

13 Q. Well, you considered incumbent addresses
14 as something to be included in your report. Correct?

15 A. I considered the primary addresses, the
16 homes of commissioners to determine whether any new
17 lines of the districts would draw the incumbents out
18 of their districts. He had a home in District 3 so
19 that home was never in risk of being drawn out of
20 District 3.

21 Q. Are you aware of any time he moved to the
22 residence that is located in the bottom of that
23 Area 13?

24 A. No.

25 Q. So if he had moved to that residence that

1 was located in the bottom of Area 13, no one
2 informed you of that?

3 A. No.

4 Q. The residence that he was living at when
5 he was elected to office, that address would be in
6 your notes. Correct?

7 A. It's in the data files.

8 Q. Those are the data files that were
9 provided to you by counsel?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. After reading that -- strike that. If I
12 could ask you to flip to page 9 in your report.
13 There you say, in Area 17 a former section of the
14 southwest part of District 2 directly below US-1 did
15 not substantially differ from the portions of
16 District 2 surrounding it. It did, however, differ
17 from -- markedly from the racial composition of the
18 receding District 4 which undercuts the argument
19 that commissioners were seeking to maintain four of
20 the districts' racial compositions.

21 Is it your understanding that the
22 commission intended to maintain the core of the
23 districts racial compositions?

24 A. I believe it was one plausible
25 explanation.

1 Q. Would you agree that even separate from
2 racial compositions, that there could be core
3 geography that would be another measure or another
4 criteria in terms of maintaining the core of
5 districts? It doesn't have to be race. Correct?

6 A. I don't know what you mean by geography.

7 Q. Well, we're looking at these redistricting
8 plans. They cover land. Correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Let me share my screen. So in looking at
11 this map, District 4 covers a particular area of the
12 city. Correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. If one were to maintain as much of the
15 core of District 4, keeping in mind that District 4
16 would need to gain population, then one probably
17 wouldn't wholesale or rewrite Districts 2, 3, and 4.
18 Correct?

19 A. It depends what your priorities are. I
20 can't tell you how to draw a map about the -- you
21 know, the specific boundaries of the cores. If
22 that's a priority, that's the commission's priority.

23 Q. Do you know which commissioner voted
24 against the plan for the 2022 enacted plan?

25 A. I believe there were two. I don't know

1 which ones.

2 Q. Is it your opinion that the city
3 commission was looking to maintain the core of the
4 districts based upon racial composition?

5 A. I don't know.

6 Q. You would agree that the changes there in
7 Area 17 appear to be at odds in terms of racial
8 motivations than those that we've discussed in
9 relation to Area 8 and Area 10 and 11. Would you
10 agree?

11 A. At least the splits -- the two precincts
12 that were split in Area 17 do look different from
13 one another racially.

14 Q. And so if the city commission was looking
15 to exacerbate the Hispanic population in District 4
16 they didn't do a very good job, did they?

17 A. I don't -- I'm not sure what you mean.

18 Q. Well, in describing some of the other
19 areas in the split analysis that you've conducted,
20 say for Area 10 and 11, comparing Districts 2 and 5
21 and Area 8 and 6 related to Districts 5 and 1, you
22 described those changes as exacerbating the existing
23 racial segregation. That's not true of Area 17, is
24 it?

25 A. The splits that were either given or

1 remained -- the splits that were given to District 4
2 have greater Hispanic VAP than the splits that
3 remained in District 2.

4 Q. In examining the other areas of
5 District 2 that District 4 could gain from, did you
6 look at any of the areas directly adjacent to Areas
7 16 and 17 and 13?

8 A. I write in the first paragraph that
9 Area 17 did not substantially differ from other
10 portions of District 2 surrounding it.

11 Q. But, again, that's -- that's a scenario
12 where -- let me back up.

13 That's the exact opposite scenario that we
14 discussed related to District 1 and District 5.
15 Correct?

16 A. No. Because the precinct splits were still
17 designed around Hispanic VAP or still differed --
18 they differed based on Hispanic VAP.

19 Q. Those two precinct splits that you
20 identified for Area 17, do you know how many
21 residents from a numerical basis are included there?

22 A. At the bottom of page 9, the District 4
23 split of Precinct 584 contains 10 percent of the VAP
24 that District 2 split contains. It's 235 individuals
25 versus 2,108.

1 Q. Okay. And so in unpacking those numbers,
2 does that mean the 235 is a reference to what is
3 retained in District 4?

4 A. What was given to District 4. Yes.

5 Q. And the 2,108, are those retained in
6 District 2?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. From a statistical significance
9 standpoint, is 235 a statistically significant group
10 of voters?

11 A. Significant relative to what?

12 Q. To the district size.

13 A. I mean, I don't -- statistical
14 significance is about an estimate. It's about
15 understanding whether an estimate is likely to be
16 correct. So these aren't estimates.

17 Q. Can you repeat your answer related to --

18 A. There is a difference between statistical
19 significance and substantive significance.
20 Statistical significance refers to estimating
21 things. Whether -- an estimate has a confidence
22 interval. It has bounds. It could be X less than the
23 estimate or it could be X more than the estimate.
24 The 235 individuals is not an estimate, it's the
25 number of individuals that lived in that precinct

1 split.

2 Q. So if we're dealing with -- and you will
3 have to forgive me. It's been almost 30 years since
4 I took statistics. So if you're talking about actual
5 numbers, I think you indicated, is that substantive
6 significance?

7 A. Substantive significance. Yes.

8 Q. Are 235 voters substantively significant
9 for a district size?

10 A. That's a subjective opinion. That's a
11 subjective decision. Subjective opinion.

12 Q. What would that subjective opinion be
13 dependent on?

14 A. It depends what your goals and your
15 preferences are about how the map should look or
16 how -- you know, whatever your opinion about what
17 matters in the map.

18 Q. Okay.

19 MR. LEVESQUE: I'm going to suggest
20 we take about a ten-minute break.

21 MR. MERKEN: Sounds good, George.

22 (Recess in proceedings.)

23 Q. Dr. Abott, if I can refer to you page 12
24 of that first report. I'm going to share my screen.
25 There again is a depiction of the areas. I want to

1 talk about Area 14 and 15 now. If I understand
2 correctly, is it your opinion that Area 14 or 15 was
3 added to offset the addition of Area 13?

4 A. That is my speculation. Yes.

5 Q. Did you do any analysis of any of those
6 geographic areas where District 3 borders District 4
7 in terms of what the Hispanic voting age population
8 is in any of those areas?

9 A. In any of those -- I'm sorry; the last
10 part you said?

11 Q. In any of those areas related to the
12 border between District 3 and District 4?

13 A. I don't think I looked particularly at the
14 border over there.

15 Q. So it's possible that District 4 could
16 have picked up population in the corner where
17 District 4 and District 3 connect and that might
18 have had the same Hispanic voting age population
19 makeup that's reflected in Area 14 or 15; you just
20 don't know. Correct?

21 A. Well, that's what I say in this paragraph
22 that Area 14 and 15 does not strongly differ from
23 the areas immediately surrounding it either in
24 District 3 or in District 4.

25 Q. Well, I guess -- is it your opinion that

1 that area was selected to offset the addition of the
2 Area 13 that had a heavier white voting age
3 population?

4 A. That was my speculation. Yes.

5 Q. You framed it as a speculation. Is that
6 one of your opinions in this case?

7 A. I cannot make judgments or draw
8 conclusions about specific motivations. I can just
9 tell you that the data suggests that Area 14, 15
10 offsets some of the whiter population that was added
11 by Area 13.

12 Q. You would agree that District 4 needed to
13 pick up population somewhere to make up that
14 difference. Correct?

15 A. Do you mean District 3?

16 Q. I'm sorry. Yes. District 3.

17 A. Let me see. Yes. District 3 needed to add
18 population. Area 13 contained 1,396 people, which is
19 only 18.6 percent of the total number of people that
20 were moved to District 3.

21 Q. So District 3 could have picked up
22 additional voters or residents from District 2 or
23 District 4 or District 1. If it's picking up voters
24 from District 4, I just want to be clear, you didn't
25 do any analysis as to whether -- and looking at my

1 cursor kind of there in that corner -- whether
2 picking up these areas would be racially the same as
3 this area, did you?

4 A. I did. I looked at the surrounding areas
5 and the areas were similar. My point was that it
6 would have made more sense, from my perspective, to
7 pick up more areas from Area 2 which was the
8 district -- sorry. From District 2. Because
9 District 2 is the area -- was the district that
10 needed to shed population. So rather than take area
11 and take population from District 4, District 3
12 could have taken more area from District 2.

13 Q. Okay. I want to talk about the alternative
14 explanations that you rejected in your report. On
15 page 12 you reject partisanship as an alternative
16 explanation. And one of the bases is that the
17 districts are nonpartisan districts.

18 Why is the fact that the districts are
19 nonpartisan districts not indicative or not
20 appropriate for consideration of a partisan
21 gerrymandering?

22 A. It's not that the districts are not
23 partisan, the commission is not partisan. The
24 commissioners who serve in the commission are
25 nonpartisan and run in nonpartisan elections. The

1 reason that partisanship is not an adequate
2 explanation right away is simply based on the fact
3 that elections are not done on a partisan basis.
4 They're not done on a partisan basis. And even
5 though it is somewhat easy to figure out the
6 partisanship of the candidate, or of the person
7 running the election, the commissioners who agreed
8 to this map did so across their party lines.

9 Q. What about consideration of issues such as
10 ideology?

11 A. What about them?

12 Q. Did you factor in the ideology of any of
13 the candidates or commissioners?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Do you know the ideology of any of the
16 commissioners?

17 A. No.

18 Q. You identified the fact that the 2022
19 enacted plan was passed on a 3-2 margin. Do you know
20 if there were other types of politics that might
21 have factored into that?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Do you know if that map was passed along
24 racial or ethnic lines?

25 A. Well, I know the commissioner from

1 District 5 was a Black Democrat and the other two
2 Republicans who joined the Democrat, I don't know
3 their race. But they weren't Black.

4 Q. Do you know the race or ethnicity of the
5 two commissioners who voted against the plan?

6 A. I don't.

7 Q. Do you think that would be relevant in
8 terms of your analysis?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Have you done any research on the City of
11 Miami's electoral politics?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And in reaching your conclusions in your
14 first report, that is not something you factor into
15 your consideration. Correct?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. In doing your analysis you relied
18 exclusively on the data to reach your conclusions.
19 Correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. In reviewing the 2022 enacted plan, would
22 you agree with the statement that the plan generally
23 maintains the cores of the existing district?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. On page 16 you have a statement, a number

1 of alternative maps were proposed but not enacted
2 and you state all maps tended to shore up existing
3 racial compositions with individual commission
4 districts, particularly those districts of 1, 2,
5 and 5.

6 So that would be true of not only the
7 enacted plan, but all of the versions that were
8 rejected by the commission as well. Correct?

9 A. All of the alternative maps that I was
10 given. Yes. All the alternative proposals that I was
11 given.

12 Q. And when you say the maps tended to shore
13 up existing racial compositions, what do you mean by
14 shore up?

15 A. What I mean is that areas that were moved
16 into those districts tended to look more like those
17 districts that they were moved into rather than
18 alternative options that were not moved into those
19 districts.

20 Q. And when you refer to the existing racial
21 composition, you don't have an opinion one way or
22 another on whether the city plan in 1997, in 2003,
23 or 2013 would have been impermissible racial
24 gerrymander, do you?

25 A. I do not have an opinion.

1 Q. If I could ask you to flip to page 1 of
2 your second report you indicate that the city's
3 proposed remedy, Resolution 23-271 differs only
4 marginally from the enjoined plan. In comparing
5 those two plans, do you know if there were any
6 efforts to address any of the criticism of the
7 Court related to the enjoined plan?

8 A. I do not.

9 Q. Did you read the Court's order relating to
10 the enjoined plan?

11 A. I did not.

12 Q. So if the Court criticized a particular
13 area of the map and the city commission addressed
14 that, your opinion wouldn't take any of that into
15 account?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Is it fair to say that just like your
18 first report, your second report relies exclusively
19 on an analysis of the data to reach its conclusions?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Under what circumstances would it be
22 appropriate to consider other factors other than
23 just the data when applying your standard
24 methodology?

25 A. I don't understand the question.

1 Q. My understanding is you used a standard
2 methodology, that's the way you described it, in
3 analyzing the data related to the maps. Correct?

4 A. Correct. Yes.

5 Q. Are there circumstances where under that
6 standard methodology it is appropriate to consider
7 things other than simply the data to look for
8 explanations as to why a certain decision was made?

9 A. Not for the questions I was asked to
10 answer by counsel.

11 Q. And remind me again, what were the
12 questions that you were asked to answer?

13 A. In the second report I was asked to use
14 data on voting age population and citizen voting age
15 population and voting patterns within individual
16 city precincts in order to determine whether and to
17 what extent race can explain the overall shapes in
18 the districts in a proposed remedy as well as the
19 changes between the enjoined plan and the proposed
20 remedy.

21 Q. Would you agree that the 2023 plan,
22 Resolution 23-271, is substantially similar to both
23 the enjoined plan and the 2013 plan?

24 A. It is to the enjoined plan. I did not
25 compare it to the 2013 plan.

1 Q. So as we sit here today you're not able to
2 offer an opinion on whether that's similar or not?

3 A. I did not compare it to the 2013 plan.

4 Q. Now on page 2, similar to your first
5 report, you indicate that you rely on the 2020
6 census data, but you also rely on the 2020 American
7 Community Survey five-year estimates. For the first
8 report you relied on the 2019 survey data. For the
9 second report, is there 2020 American Community
10 Survey data?

11 A. Can you say the last part again?

12 Q. Is there 2020 American Community Survey
13 five-year estimate data for 2020?

14 A. In the appendix. Yes.

15 Q. And is that -- do you know if the 2021
16 American Community Survey five-year estimate data
17 was available?

18 A. I don't know.

19 Q. Is there a reason why you used 2019 for
20 the first report and 2020 for the second report?

21 A. That's the data that counsel asked me to
22 use.

23 Q. Do you know when the 2021 American
24 Community Survey five-year estimates were released?

25 A. I do not know.

1 Q. Do you know if it was available at the
2 time that you did this report?

3 A. I do not know.

4 Q. Do you know if the data would have
5 reflected something different either than 2019 or
6 2021?

7 A. I do not know.

8 Q. Do you know how many commissioners
9 supported the 2023 plan?

10 A. I do not know.

11 Q. And just like the first report related to
12 the 2022 plan, you didn't review any transcripts
13 related to the enactment of the 2023 plan. Correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Would you agree that if a city commission
16 draws a non-compact district that they can do it for
17 nonracial reasons?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. There might be any number of
20 constitutional reasons why they might draw a
21 non-compact district. Correct?

22 MR. MERKEN: Objection to the form to
23 the extent it calls for a legal
24 conclusion.

25 Q. You can answer, Doctor.

1 A. There are other reasons -- there are
2 reasons why someone -- a commission might draw a
3 non-compact district that's not related to race.

4 Q. What are some of those otherwise
5 acceptable reasons why they might draw a non-compact
6 district that has nothing to do with race?

7 A. I cannot -- I can't speculate.

8 Q. I'm not asking you to speculate as to why
9 this particular city commission; I'm just asking you
10 are you aware of what other non-compact -- what
11 other reasons might exist for any commission to draw
12 a non-compact district?

13 A. Geographical features in the landscape.
14 Partisan concerns. The size of the population in
15 those areas.

16 Q. Is there a reason why you compared the
17 23-271 plan, the 2023 plan, to the enjoined plan and
18 not the benchmark plan?

19 A. That's what counsel asked me to do.

20 Q. Would you agree that under either the 2022
21 plan or the 2023 plan, that Districts 1, 3, and 4
22 became less Hispanic?

23 A. No. No. Under the 2022 plan, District 1
24 went from being 89.5 percent Hispanic VAP to 89.7
25 percent Hispanic VAP. District 3 went from 88.3 to

1 84.5, which was a decrease. And District -- sorry.
2 What was the last one?

3 Q. Are you -- which plan -- which plan are
4 you -- it would be 4, but which plan are you
5 comparing to which?

6 A. The enjoined plan to the 2020 -- the 2022
7 plan to the 2023 plan.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. Then in District 4, Hispanic VAP went from
10 89.5 percent to 90.0 percent.

11 Q. Okay. My question was -- and I'll break it
12 down. Because my question was actually related to
13 both, the 2022 and the 2023 compared to the 2013
14 plan.

15 A. Okay.

16 Q. Compared to the 2013 plan, the 2022 plan,
17 Districts 1, 3, and 4 become less Hispanic. Correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. And District 5 becomes less Black.

20 Correct?

21 A. Between the 2013 and the 2022 plan, yes.

22 Q. Correct. And then comparing the 2023 plan
23 to the 2013 plan, the same is also true for all
24 three of those districts. Correct?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And the same is also true for District 5,
2 the Black district?

3 A. Yes. Correct.

4 Q. Did you do any analysis as to whether the
5 city commission could have drawn districts that were
6 higher in Hispanic percentage for Districts 1, 3, or
7 4?

8 A. I did not.

9 Q. And the same question for District 5.

10 A. I did not.

11 Q. Did you ever speak with Dr. Moy?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. How many times?

14 A. In the capacity of working on this
15 case or --

16 Q. Yes.

17 A. I believe we e-mailed once or twice.

18 Q. Do you know if counsel was included on
19 those e-mails?

20 A. I cannot recall.

21 Q. Did you speak with Dr. McCartan at all
22 related to this case?

23 A. I did not.

24 Q. I'm going to share my screen a little bit.
25 We're going to talk through some of the changes in

1 the map. Are you able to see that okay?

2 A. Yeah.

3 Q. Okay.

4 MR. MERKEN: George, could you
5 please make it a little bit larger?

6 MR. LEVESQUE: I can. How about I do
7 that. And I can scroll around to
8 different areas that we'll be discussing.

9 MR. MERKEN: Is that okay?

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's fine.

11 MR. MERKEN: Thank you, George.

12 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

13 Q. The first area I want to talk about is
14 this area here (indicating). This area, District 1,
15 and this area is District 4. You're critical of the
16 move of that little sliver between District 6. Can
17 you explain why?

18 A. Are you referring to Area 6 right now?

19 Q. Yes. I apologize. Area 6. Can you tell me
20 why?

21 A. Yeah. One second. So what is -- can you
22 repeat the question about Area 6, please?

23 Q. On page 5, I'm trying to ascertain the
24 significance of both the table and the reference in
25 the paragraph above as to the significance of

1 highlighting Area 6 in your report.

2 A. All of the areas that were highlighted in
3 teal in Table 3 are areas that were moved into
4 District 1 between the 2022 plan and the 2023 plan.
5 So it was a comparison of the two plans looking at
6 what was moved into District 1 from the previous
7 plan.

8 Q. Is the move of that Area 6 from District 4
9 to District 1 problematic in your mind?

10 A. I don't -- they -- it was an area -- Area
11 6 is a small population and it had a very high
12 Hispanic VAP, but I don't think I highlighted these
13 as -- because they were necessarily problematic. I
14 highlighted them to describe what changes were being
15 made between the two plans.

16 Q. Let me put it this way. You've identified
17 several areas there in Table 3 related to the
18 movements involving District 1. Which changes are
19 indicative of race-based criteria then?

20 A. I think my point in highlighting these was
21 that there was actually very little change between
22 the two plans.

23 Q. For District 1?

24 A. For District 1.

25 Q. Do you see any of the changes that were

1 made to District 1 as being problematic?

2 A. I don't -- I'm not in a position to draw a
3 conclusion about whether they were problematic or
4 not.

5 Q. Let me -- I'll sort of rephrase it. Do you
6 see any of those changes that were made to
7 District 1 as being drawn in a way that race is the
8 predominant factor?

9 A. I don't -- I don't -- I don't -- I don't
10 have an answer to that. I don't -- I don't know.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. Because the changes made were very
13 minimal. As I said in the second paragraph on
14 page 5, the districts are of similar racial
15 composition and this movement made little difference
16 to either of their overall racial VAP.

17 Q. Let's talk about some of the changes that
18 were made in District 2. Yo can see district -- that
19 Area 10 is being added back into District 2. Are you
20 critical of the commission's decision to add that
21 area back into District 2?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Are you critical of the decision to add
24 this area of 11 back into District 3?

25 A. I don't have an opinion.

1 Q. Would you agree that that addition is very
2 similar to -- strike that. Let me ask this. Are
3 there any changes to District 2 that you feel were
4 drawn primarily on race-based criteria?

5 A. The areas that were moved into
6 District 2 look more similar racially to
7 District 2 than the donor districts.

8 Q. So is that -- can you translate that for
9 me?

10 A. Translate it into what? You want me to
11 rephrase it?

12 Q. Well, are the -- I'm trying to
13 understand -- my question was, do you feel any of
14 the changes to District 2 were made based upon
15 race-based criteria?

16 A. Between the '22 plan -- the 2022 plan and
17 the 2023 plan?

18 Q. Correct.

19 A. I don't have an opinion other than to say
20 that the districts -- the areas looked different
21 racially between the donor districts and the
22 recipient districts.

23 Q. Okay. But you don't have an opinion on
24 whether race predominated those decisions?

25 A. I don't. I wasn't -- I wasn't asked to do

1 that. I was simply asked to compare the two plans.

2 Q. Well, were you asked to draw conclusions
3 related to the 2022 plan?

4 A. The changes to the '22 plan?

5 Q. No. I'm kind of backtracking a little bit
6 so I understand what you were asked to do. In
7 relation to the 2022 plan, were you asked to draw
8 conclusions from the data related to the changes
9 that were made to the 2022 -- I'm sorry. Changes
10 made to the districts to reach the 2022 plan?

11 A. I was asked to look at the differences
12 between the two plans.

13 Q. And when you say the two plans, are you
14 referring to 2013 and 2022 or are you referring to
15 2022 and 2023?

16 A. 2022 and 2023.

17 Q. So other than noting the differences
18 between 2022 and 2023, you weren't asked to draw any
19 conclusions as to what might have been the
20 motivating factors in those changes?

21 A. I didn't do the same sort of analysis I
22 did in the first expert report where I looked at
23 surrounding possible precincts that could have been
24 moved rather than the ones that were moved.

25 Q. And I think related to the 2022 plan, your

1 opinion was that on a districtwide basis there was
2 not a racially significant change from 2013 to 2022;
3 is that correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Is the same also true for the 2023 plan?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. At the bottom of page 8 you state:
8 Collectively the areas moved out of Districts 1, 3,
9 and 4 have much lower Hispanic VAP -- turning over
10 to page 9 -- 58.8 percent than the enjoined
11 districts 85.6 and 89.6, making that three district
12 grouping more concentrated to a Hispanic VAP.

13 Is that just a factual observation that
14 you're making?

15 A. It is a factual observation I'm making.

16 Q. Are you drawing any conclusions from that
17 factual observation?

18 A. Not from that factual observation alone.

19 Q. Well, let me ask this. Is it your opinion
20 that the city commission drew the 2023 plan to shore
21 up the three Hispanic districts with additional
22 Hispanic voters?

23 A. I don't think the changes between the 2022
24 plan and the 2023 plan were notably different for
25 the Hispanic super majority districts.

1 Q. Okay. So what conclusion would you be
2 drawing either in part or in whole from that factual
3 observation related to the three district grouping
4 being more concentrated in its Hispanic VAP?

5 A. Are you referring to specific areas or
6 just all of the -- all of the areas that were moved
7 out of the majority Hispanic districts?

8 Q. Well, I had read that sentence and I asked
9 if you were drawing any conclusions or relying on
10 that for any conclusions and you said not -- and I'm
11 paraphrasing. My impression from your answer was
12 that that would not serve as the basis -- the sole
13 basis for conclusion but it might factor into other
14 conclusions. I'm inquiring as to what those other
15 conclusions are that would rely on that factual
16 basis.

17 A. There are no other conclusions. But
18 conclusions -- the observations that the -- the
19 areas that were moved out of the Hispanic super
20 majority districts are lower in Hispanic VAP than
21 the areas that were moved out of the enjoined
22 districts.

23 Q. Okay. What effect would that have on
24 District 2?

25 A. It would shore up -- it would shore up

1 District 2's racial composition.

2 Q. In which direction?

3 A. What do you mean by which direction?

4 Q. Well, related to Hispanic voters, what did
5 those movements do for District 2?

6 A. Sorry. Can we go back -- can you clarify
7 exactly which areas you're referring to? Just so
8 we're all on the same page.

9 Q. I'm referring to the areas that were moved
10 out of Districts 1, 3, and 4. Your statement at the
11 bottom of page 8.

12 A. Right. Are these areas that were moved
13 directly into District 2 that you're talking about?

14 Q. Yes.

15 A. Okay. Do we have a specific -- are you
16 looking at a specific table?

17 Q. Let's look at Area 10 that's on the screen
18 there.

19 A. Yeah.

20 Q. What effect would moving that into
21 District 2 have on District 2 in terms of Hispanic
22 voters?

23 A. It would probably not do much because it's
24 similar to the racial composition of District 2.
25 Relative to the 2022 plan it would add in -- it

1 would add in some more Hispanic voters that had been
2 taken out. But the composition of that area is very
3 similar to the composition of District 2 as a whole.

4 Q. What about for Area 11?

5 A. Well, the same answer except it was
6 removed from District 2. So it was an area that was
7 very similar to District 2 that was removed from
8 District 2. But it was not similar to the district
9 it was moved into, which is District 3.

10 Q. Other than making those observations about
11 similarities and dissimilarities, you're not making
12 any conclusions from that related to these changes?

13 A. Not those specific changes, no.

14 Q. What about the changes to Area 12?

15 A. Area 12, it's that little --

16 Q. Right in there (indicating).

17 A. Okay. Similar -- moving a portion of
18 the -- moving an area that looks not like its donor
19 district, Area 3, which was super majority
20 Hispanic -- moving that area into -- back into
21 District 2, which looked more like District 2 as a
22 whole.

23 Q. Other than the factual observation, you're
24 not drawing any further conclusions from that?

25 A. No. Correct.

1 Q. Area 9, other than making the factual
2 observations related to Area 9, do you draw any
3 further conclusions related to Area 9?

4 A. No. It was a high Hispanic area moved
5 between two high Hispanic districts.

6 Q. And what about for Area 20? Other than
7 making factual observations about the population
8 that is being moved, do you draw any conclusions
9 about the addition of that area to District 5?

10 A. No.

11 Q. What about for Area 19 that was moved from
12 District 5 into District 2? Other than making
13 factual observations about the move, do you draw any
14 conclusions from that move?

15 A. Well, so Area 19 had a lower Black VAP
16 than the District 5 as a whole and it was given to
17 District 2. So that it looked more like District 2,
18 the recipient district, which did affect or would be
19 more likely to affect the overall racial composition
20 of District 5.

21 Q. Do you know if the racial composition of
22 District 5 changed between the 2022 plan to the 2023
23 plan?

24 A. It did not.

25 Q. Okay. For Area 13 and 14 there, between

1 District 1 and District 5, that little spot, other
2 than making factual observations about the
3 population being exchanged between those two
4 districts, do you draw any conclusions from those
5 changes?

6 A. Again, 13 and 14?

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Area 13 had a higher Black VAP than
9 District 1 and that was moved into District 5 which
10 was majority Black. Area 14 has a high Hispanic VAP
11 compared to District 5, which is what it was being
12 moved from and a relatively low Black VAP.

13 Q. Other than the factual observations that
14 you just described, do you draw any conclusion --
15 did you draw any further conclusions from those
16 factual observations?

17 A. The changes to the Black VAP in the 2022
18 map was not changed significantly by the 2023 map.

19 Q. Do you reach the conclusion, then, that
20 those changes related to Areas 13 and 14 indicate
21 map drawing based upon race-based criteria?

22 A. Race was taken into account.

23 Q. It was taken into account for Areas 13 and
24 14?

25 A. They look different given that they were

1 swapped from the same donor and recipient -- from
2 the same districts given that they were exchanged in
3 the swap and that they look racially different,
4 their composition is racially different. That
5 suggests to me that race was considered.

6 Q. Related to the changes to the -- in that
7 Area 13, do you agree that that would tend to make
8 District 5 a district with a 50.3 Black voting age
9 population less Black and more Hispanic?

10 A. Yes. But as I've said before, you have to
11 take into consideration alternative movements. But
12 yes.

13 Q. Well, in looking at at least one of the
14 alternative movements between District 3 -- I'm
15 sorry -- District 1 and District 5, in that Area 14,
16 that would make District 1, which is a Hispanic
17 district, more Black and less Hispanic. Correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And so at least as it relates to 13 and
20 14, those are going against the majority population
21 in those districts?

22 A. There's a difference in population size
23 between the two areas as well. So there are -- you
24 know, much -- there are, what, a quarter of the
25 people in Area 14 as there are in Area 13.

1 Q. Okay. Well, let's look at Area 15, then.
2 It was moved from 5 into 1. Would you agree that
3 that would also make District 1 more Black and less
4 Hispanic without having a significant change to
5 District 5?

6 A. Area 15 that was moved to District 1 has a
7 higher Black voting age population than district --
8 than Area 16. Yes. That is correct.

9 Q. And District 16 -- I'm sorry. Not District
10 16. Area 16 that was moved from District 1 into
11 District 5 would have a tendency to make District 5,
12 a Black district, more Hispanic and less Black.
13 Correct?

14 A. Correct. Compared at least -- without
15 looking at other options, yes.

16 Q. So at least in looking at those -- and you
17 would agree the change in 17 only involves ten
18 people. Correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Of the changes that are detailed in Areas
21 13 and 15, all of those areas fall -- are made in a
22 direction that would be opposite to shoring up the
23 district that is getting that population. Correct?

24 A. Without comparing it to other options,
25 that is correct. But noting also that the number of

1 people moved to each of these areas is quite small.

2 Q. Okay. When you say they are quite small,
3 what are you referring to? What is your comparison
4 there?

5 A. I'm sorry. What was the last part you
6 said?

7 Q. What is your comparison?

8 A. To the overall number of people who are
9 moved in the 2022 plan.

10 Q. Okay. So in terms of all of the people
11 moved in all of the districts, these changes are
12 small?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. But if I understood correctly, you were
15 saying these changes were indicative of race-based
16 map drawing. Did I understand that correctly?

17 A. That they were or were not?

18 Q. That they were.

19 A. They take race into account. Yes.

20 Q. They do take race into account. How do
21 they take race into account?

22 A. They look different than the other areas
23 surrounding them or in the districts.

24 Q. Well, I guess, Doctor, what -- what are
25 the determining factors when you're moving an

1 area -- into a district or out of a district as to
2 whether race is a criteria?

3 A. If the area looks different racially than
4 other areas or the districts.

5 Q. Okay. So let's break that down. If I'm
6 moving an area from District 1 into District 5 and
7 the racial composition is either the same as 1 or
8 the same as 5, I'm going from 1 to 5 -- let me start
9 my hypothetical over.

10 If I'm moving a population from District 1
11 to District 5 and the racial composition of the
12 district is the same as District 1, is that a
13 movement that would be indicative of race-based
14 decision-making?

15 A. If it looks different than the other
16 surrounding areas that could have been moved.

17 Q. Okay. For the 2023 plan, did you do any
18 analysis of the other surrounding areas?

19 A. No. Except for -- except for the Overtown
20 area.

21 Q. Okay. Apart from the Overtown, did you
22 analyze the surrounding areas for any of the other
23 changes that were made?

24 A. No. I was not asked to do that.

25 Q. So as we sit here today, then, you're not

1 able to say one way or another whether any of the
2 other changes reflect race-based decision-making; is
3 that correct?

4 A. My conclusion from this expert report was
5 that the two maps were not substantially different
6 from one another.

7 Q. Okay. But other than that, you did not
8 examine the individual decisions like you did with
9 the 2022 plan. Correct?

10 A. I did not look at alternative options.

11 Q. And you would need to do that to draw the
12 conclusions as to whether a particular movement was
13 indicative of race-based criteria. Correct?

14 A. For each individual area and each
15 individual movement I would say that is correct. I
16 looked at Overtown and did a similar -- a similar
17 thing that I did with the first report.

18 Q. So talk to me about your work on Overtown.
19 What did you look at when evaluating the changes
20 that were made to Overtown?

21 A. I looked at what areas were moved and what
22 areas were not moved.

23 Q. Okay. And in terms of the map that we're
24 looking at, what areas reflect where Overtown is?

25 A. There are multiple definitions of

1 Overtown.

2 Q. Do you have an opinion as to which
3 definition of Overtown should be used?

4 A. I do not.

5 Q. Do you know if the definition that is
6 reflected in the map that was put together at the
7 June 14th commission meeting reflects
8 Mr. De Grandy's understanding of where the Overtown
9 historic borders are or whether it reflects the city
10 commission's understanding where the Overtown
11 historic borders are?

12 A. I --

13 MR. MERKEN: Objection to form. You
14 can answer it if you understand it.

15 A. Yeah. I don't know the difference between
16 De Grandy's definition and the city's definition.

17 Q. All right.

18 A. Or the commission's definition.

19 Q. Now, as it relates to how the city drew
20 the borders of the Overtown area, what are your
21 conclusions about how the city drew the borders of
22 the Overtown area?

23 A. Do you mean De Grandy?

24 Q. I mean, the Overtown area that is
25 reflected in the 2023 plan.

1 A. There is no designation of Overtown in the
2 2023 plan.

3 Q. Well, I guess -- Mr. De Grandy is the
4 city's consultant. Correct?

5 A. As far as I understand. Yes.

6 Q. I'll represent to you that he is the
7 city's map drawing consultant and legal counsel for
8 the purposes of drawing maps. The changes that are
9 currently reflected on the screen to Overtown, do
10 you understand those to be Mr. De Grandy's
11 alterations?

12 A. No, I don't.

13 Q. Okay. On page 11 of your report where you
14 refer to, overall, De Grandy's boundaries of
15 historic Overtown are considerably more restrictive
16 than both city code and the GMCVB/NET/MPD
17 definition. I guess, what description of boundaries
18 are you referring to when you refer to De Grandy's
19 boundaries?

20 A. I'm looking at Figure 3, the top left map,
21 top of panel where the yellow Area 34 is, according
22 to counsel, De Grandy's definition of historic
23 Overtown. Whereas that area plus the teal area,
24 Area 35, is more expansive is the definition that is
25 in the city code that's excluded from De Grandy's

1 definition of historic Overtown.

2 Q. Would you agree that Figure 3, that top
3 left picture, generally would match the area that is
4 depicted in the changes to the enjoined plan and the
5 2023 plan that are reflected in that Area 16 and the
6 area north of 17?

7 A. I think that's correct, but I don't -- I
8 don't have the exact -- these are different maps so
9 I can't tell you for sure.

10 Q. The maps in Figure 3, did you draw those?

11 A. I did not.

12 Q. Do you know who did?

13 A. I do not.

14 Q. Were those provided to you by counsel?

15 A. They were.

16 Q. Related to your analysis of Overtown, what
17 were you asked to do?

18 A. I was asked to compare the areas -- the
19 racial composition of the areas that were included
20 in De Grandy's definition to the racial composition
21 of the areas that were excluded from De Grandy's
22 definition but included in other versions -- other
23 definitions of historic Overtown. Official
24 definitions from the city and from tourist --
25 tourism groups.

1 Q. The definitions that you have cited in
2 your report, did you research and find those or were
3 those provided to you?

4 A. I think the city code text -- any other
5 text was provided to me were sources.

6 Q. What about the Miami Police Department or
7 the greater Miami, Miami convention and visitors
8 bureau definitions?

9 A. Yes. Both. All three.

10 Q. All three were provided? Were they --
11 sorry.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Were there any definitions that you
14 researched that you found in addition to those
15 three?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Have you done any research on the
18 historical background of Overtown?

19 A. No.

20 Q. What is your understanding of what
21 Overtown is?

22 A. My understanding is that historic Overtown
23 is an area that -- part of which is -- has a high
24 Black VAP, but that other parts of historic Overtown
25 do not depending on the definition.

1 Q. Do you know if the borders of what the
2 locals -- strike that.

3 Did you speak to anyone concerning what
4 those who live in that area would consider Overtown
5 to be now?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Are you aware of the history of Overtown
8 and the construction of I-95 through Overtown?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Did anyone discuss how the construction of
11 I-95 severed Overtown and over time the two sides
12 lost their joint identities?

13 A. No.

14 MR. LEVESQUE: Okay, Doctor. What I
15 would like to do is, I would like to take
16 a five-minute break and I think I can
17 sort of be in a position to make a final
18 push if that works.

19 MR. MERKEN: Sounds good. Thank you,
20 George. We'll be back at 1:00.

21 (Recess in proceedings.)

22 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

23 Q. Dr. Abott, in the final portion of your
24 second report you refer to the partisan motivations
25 not being an acceptable explanation as to why the

1 changes were made to the 2023 plan. The changes that
2 were made to the 2023 plan, did they significantly
3 alter the performance of any of the districts?

4 A. What do you mean by performance?

5 Q. Where they would perform for a Republican
6 or a Democrat?

7 A. I only looked at the 2020 presidential
8 election. I didn't look at any subsequent elections.

9 Q. Did you also look at the 2018
10 gubernatorial election?

11 A. Not in this report.

12 Q. Okay. For either your work on the 2022
13 plan related to assessing partisanship as an
14 explanation or the 2023 plan, did you examine any
15 local elections as to how any of the commissioners
16 might perform in a given district?

17 A. I didn't look at any other elections.

18 Q. Okay. So what race or ethnicity is
19 President Trump?

20 A. White.

21 Q. And do you know the race or ethnicity of
22 Governor DeSantis?

23 A. I do not.

24 Q. Have you done any analysis as to whether a
25 Hispanic candidate running in one of the city

1 commission districts would perform better or worse
2 compared to either President Trump or Governor
3 DeSantis?

4 A. I have not looked at city commission
5 elections.

6 Q. So if it's possible for a Hispanic city
7 commissioner to get a bump in a nonpartisan election
8 that would outperform either President Trump or
9 Governor DeSantis, that's not something you would
10 have any insight on because that's not an analysis
11 that you've conducted?

12 A. It is not.

13 Q. Would you agree, then, that your analysis
14 of partisanship based upon just those two elections
15 without considering how a Hispanic commissioner
16 running in a Hispanic district might not be fully
17 accounted for in terms of how the map drawing could
18 be done?

19 A. No. I was looking at partisanship, not at
20 race.

21 Q. Is sometimes race a factor that's -- well,
22 let me strike that.

23 Is race sometimes a factor that comes into
24 play in elections?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And I think in regards to both your
2 assessment of the 2022 plan and that 2023 plan, your
3 conclusions are led by the data. Correct?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. And at least as it relates to the city's
6 historical districts, you believe the data shows
7 that the city is racially segregated along district
8 lines. Is that fair?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And in the course of this -- your work on
11 this litigation, you've not been asked to look at
12 any of the plaintiffs' plans for the purposes of
13 issuing opinions. Correct?

14 A. I was given one of plaintiffs' proposed
15 plans, but I did not look at it. I was given the
16 option to look at it. But I did not.

17 Q. Why didn't you want to look at their
18 proposed plan?

19 A. It was outside the scope of what the
20 directives were.

21 Q. If their three plans had super majority
22 Hispanic districts and a district that would perform
23 for a Black district similar to District 5, would
24 you agree that that is a racially segregated plan as
25 well?

1 A. If the -- if the districts looked as
2 similar -- you know, if the districts looked as
3 similar to what they look like now under the various
4 plans, if they did in '97, 2003, and 2013, then yes,
5 the districts are racially drawn. Racially
6 segregated.

7 Q. And when you say if they look, are you
8 referring to a visual depiction or are you referring
9 to what the data actually says?

10 A. Both. The visual depiction is part of the
11 data, but yes.

12 Q. On page 12, at the bottom you say, further
13 Precinct 989, 78 percent Trump was moved in its
14 entirety from District 1 into District 3. In
15 exchange most of the less Republican precincts, and
16 you reference 997 and 971, were added to District 1
17 from Districts 3 and 4. These movements suggest that
18 enhancing Republican advantage in District 1 was not
19 a motivation behind the map.

20 Would you agree that both precincts
21 supported Trump based upon your numbers?

22 A. Which precincts are you referring to?

23 Q. 997 and 971.

24 A. Over 50 percent Trump. Yes.

25 Q. So you're certainly not doing damage to

1 District 1 if you were trying to draw a Republican
2 district. Correct?

3 A. The claim is that -- the claim that I'm
4 addressing is that they are shoring up the
5 Republican advantage. Not maintaining Republican
6 control or a Republican majority, but that they are
7 shoring up the percentages of their Republican
8 voters.

9 Q. What is -- what is your understanding of
10 what the city commission's partisan goals were?

11 A. I don't know what the city commission's
12 partisan goals were.

13 Q. Okay. You address partisanship in both of
14 your reports. What were you told related to your
15 work on that particular aspect of your report?

16 A. I was asked to address the alternative
17 explanation that these districts were drawn and
18 changed in such ways as to shore up partisan support
19 within the district core.

20 Q. Did they provide any context for that?

21 A. No.

22 Q. So if the city adhered to a particular
23 configuration of Districts 1, 3, and 4 --

24 A. Sorry. You cut out. I couldn't hear you.

25 Q. So if the city adhered to a particular

1 configuration of Districts 1, 3, and 4 that split
2 one of the western parts of the county -- I'm sorry.
3 Western parts of the city, that's not something that
4 you would have any knowledge of? That's not
5 something that factored into any of your analyses of
6 the maps that you reviewed. Correct?

7 A. No. No knowledge of that.

8 MR. LEVESQUE: Dr. Abbott, that's all
9 the questions that I have right now.

10 MR. MERKEN: I just have a few,
11 George.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. MERKEN:

14 Q. Dr. Abbott, were you shown any of
15 plaintiffs' maps during this deposition?

16 A. During the deposition, no.

17 Q. Had you performed any analysis of any of
18 the plaintiffs' proposed plans before today?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Was any testimony today about any of the
21 plaintiffs proposed maps purely speculative?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. The city commission elections are
24 nonpartisan?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Was any part of either of your two reports
2 based on whether a district -- whether a commission
3 district would elect candidates of a certain race?

4 A. No.

5 Q. You testified about conclusions you drew
6 in your second report, the report dated July 5th,
7 2023. Do you remember that testimony?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. On page 13 of that report there is a
10 section labeled conclusion. And I'm going to read
11 that in its entirety and just let me know if this is
12 an accurate reading of this. You write, quote, the
13 city's proposed remedy, Resolution 23-271, for the
14 Miami city commission has not been substantially
15 changed from the enjoined plan. The changes that
16 have occurred appear to continue to be designed
17 around racial and ethnic considerations. There is no
18 basis on which to make the argument that these
19 considerations were instead partisan in nature.

20 Did I accurately read your conclusion?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Is that your conclusion about the changes
23 between the 2023 map and the 2022 map?

24 A. Yes.

25 MR. MERKEN: Nothing further.

1 MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. I have a few
2 follow-ups. Actually probably more than a
3 few to respond to that last question.

4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. LEVESQUE:

6 Q. Dr. Abott, related to the 2023 plan, and
7 your opinion that it continues to reflect a racial
8 gerrymander, that would also be true because it's
9 your opinion that the 1997 plan, the 2003 plan, and
10 the 2013 plan represent racially segregated
11 districts. Correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And so any map that has super majority
14 Hispanic districts above 80 percent in number, any
15 map that has a Black voting age population within
16 two or three percentage points of 50 percent that
17 would reliably perform for a Black candidate are
18 going to be racially segregated districts in your
19 view. Correct?

20 A. Not necessarily.

21 Q. What are the circumstances where three
22 super majority Hispanic districts stand in either an
23 almost majority or majority Black district not be
24 racially segregated?

25 A. I would have to look at the map to make

1 that conclusion.

2 Q. Okay. Dr. Abbott, that is plaintiffs'
3 alternative plan 1 that was presented in this
4 litigation. That's not a map that you've analyzed as
5 part of your work in this case. Correct?

6 A. No. Correct.

7 Q. And I'll represent to you that Districts
8 1, 3, and 4 in that map have Hispanic voting age
9 populations of 70.1 percent, 90.8 percent, and
10 95 percent. And they have a Black voting age
11 population for District 5 at 45.2 percent. Given
12 those statistics, would it be your opinion that that
13 is a racially segregated map?

14 A. I would have to do more analysis. I don't
15 feel comfortable responding to that question.

16 Q. Okay. What more analysis would you need to
17 do?

18 A. I would need to look at the boundaries and
19 understand how the districts were drawn.

20 Q. Well, you didn't do --

21 A. And the white voting age population.

22 Q. You didn't do a boundary analysis for the
23 1997 plan or the 2003 plan or the 2013 plan to reach
24 the conclusion that those maps were racially
25 segregated districts. Correct?

1 A. I did a visual inspection of how they
2 looked compared to the 2013 and the 2022 map and,
3 given my analysis of those maps, concluded that they
4 were very similar.

5 Q. But you came in with the conclusion that
6 the five districts were already racially segregated
7 because of the 1997 plan, the 2003 plan, and even
8 the 2013 plan. Did I not understand that correctly?

9 A. Well, I didn't come into this assuming
10 that. I compared them to the current -- to the 2013
11 and the 2022 plan.

12 Q. Well, in the opening statement of your
13 first report you say, the enacted Miami city
14 commission districting plan is the byproduct of many
15 decades of racialized commission plans. That would
16 seem to imply that the 2022 plan didn't make the
17 other plans racially racialized, it followed in the
18 footsteps of racialized commission plans. Correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And you didn't do a boundary analysis or
21 even an analysis of what the populations were in any
22 of the districts or the city as a whole related to
23 either the '97, the 2003, or the 2013 plan. Correct?

24 A. I looked at how similar the maps were to
25 the current plans -- to the more recent plans.

1 Q. But you didn't do the boundary analysis
2 that you just referenced, did you?

3 A. To the '97 and 2003 plans?

4 Q. Or the 2013 plan?

5 A. I did not do a boundary analysis on the
6 earlier plans.

7 Q. But you still reached the conclusion that
8 they were racialized commission maps. Correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you did that simply because they had
11 large segments of minority population in one
12 district. Correct?

13 A. No. I did that because they looked very
14 similar to the 2022 and the 2013 maps.

15 Q. So you -- just so I understand, then, you
16 reached the conclusion that the 1997 plan and the
17 2003 plan and the 2013 plan were racialized maps
18 because they looked similar to the 2022 plan that
19 you analyzed?

20 A. There were very few changes over the
21 years.

22 Q. Okay. Give me one more second. Dr. Abott,
23 I'm going to represent to you that that is
24 plaintiffs' map 4 that was filed in this litigation
25 as an alternative remedy. Have you seen this map

1 before at all?

2 A. I have not.

3 Q. You were not asked to do any type of
4 analysis on this map. Correct?

5 A. I was not.

6 Q. Generally speaking, if you've got the 2023
7 plan available to you, would you agree that
8 District 2 and District 5 visually are similar to
9 what is reflected in the 2023 plan?

10 A. They look different to me.

11 Q. Okay. What is different about them?

12 A. There are different portions of District 5
13 that look to have been moved into District 1 in the
14 2023 plan.

15 Q. Are they large areas that significantly
16 revamp the configuration of that district?

17 A. I don't know. I haven't done the
18 analysis.

19 Q. Do you know if the population figures are
20 substantially similar?

21 A. I don't know, but I know -- I can see from
22 this map on page 3 that the part of District 5 that
23 is in District 1 in the plaintiffs' map is downtown
24 so --

25 Q. Do you also notice a difference in the

1 configuration of District 1 and District 4?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. You've examined the historical plans in
4 the 2022 and the 2023 plan. Are you aware of any of
5 those plans that configure Districts 1, 3, or 4 in
6 that manner?

7 A. I don't know. I don't have them in front
8 of me.

9 Q. Dr. Abott, do you recognize that plan?

10 A. It says the 1997 plan.

11 Q. Does that look like the 1997 plan that you
12 reviewed?

13 A. I believe so.

14 Q. And does that plan draw District 4
15 entirely within the western part of the city's
16 boundaries?

17 A. What do you mean the western part?

18 Q. This area here (indicating). There is an
19 area called Flagami.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Is District 4 entirely in that area or is
22 it split between Districts 1 and 4?

23 A. There is a portion of District 1 that's on
24 top of District 4 towards the west, but I don't know
25 about Flagami specifically.

1 Q. Okay. No one has ever discussed Flagami
2 with you in terms of the analysis of the plans, have
3 they?

4 A. No.

5 Q. As part of your analysis, you've not done
6 any research or issued any opinions or conclusions
7 about neighborhoods and keeping them whole, have
8 you?

9 A. No. Other than Overtown.

10 Q. As part of your analysis, you've not done
11 anything to identify or assess voter cohesion, have
12 you?

13 A. No.

14 MR. LEVESQUE: That's all at this
15 time.

16 MR. MERKEN: All right. We're all
17 set. We will read.

18 MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. Madam Court
19 Reporter, we'll order a copy.

20 (Defendant's Exhibit 1, Report, was
21 marked for Identification.)

22

23 (Thereupon, the taking of the deposition was
24 concluded at 1:29 p.m.)

25 (Signature and formalities were not waived.)

1 Christopher Merken, Esquire
christopher.merken@dechert.com

2 (October 27th, 2023

3
4 RE: Grace, Inc., et al v. City of Miami
October 16th, 2023-Dr. Carolyn Abott

5
6 The above-referenced transcript is available
for review.

7 The witness should read the testimony to
8 verify its accuracy. If there are any changes,
9 the witness should note those with the reason
10 on the attached errata sheet.

11 The witness should, please, date and sign the
12 errata sheet and e-mail to the deposing attorney as
13 well as to Veritext at Transcripts-fl@veritext.com
14 and copies will be e-mailed to all ordering parties.

15 It is suggested that the completed errata be
16 returned 30 days from receipt of testimony, as
17 considered reasonable under Federal rules*.
18 However, there is no Florida statute to this regard.

19 If the witness fails to do so, the transcript
20 may be used as if signed.

21 Yours,

22
23 Veritext Legal Solutions

24 *Federal Civil Procedure Rule 30(e)/Florida Civil
25 Procedure Rule 1.310(e).

Grace, Inc., et al v. City of Miami

October 16th, 2023-Dr. Carolyn Abott

E R R A T A S H E E T

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____

REASON_____

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____

REASON_____

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____

REASON_____

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____

REASON_____

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____

REASON_____

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I
have read the foregoing document and that the facts
Stated in it are true.

DR. CAROLYN ABOTT

DATE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF OATH
(VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS)
STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE)

I, Mayra Texeira, Court Reporter and Notary
Public in and for the State of Florida at Large,
certify that the witness, DR. CAROLYN ABOTT,
appeared before me via videoconference on
October 16th, 2023 and was duly sworn by me.

Signed this 27th day of October, 2023.



MAYRA TEXEIRA, Court Reporter
Notary Public - State of Florida
COMMISSION NO. HH 12099
EXPIRES JUNE 26, 2024

Personally known _____
OR Produced Identification X
Type of Identification Produced NY DL

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE)

I, MAYRA TEXEIRA, Court Reporter, do hereby
certify that I was authorized to and did
stenographically report the videoconference
deposition of DR. CAROLYN ABOTT; that a review of
the transcript was not waived; and that the
foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 123, is a true
and complete record of my stenographic notes.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
nor am I a relative or employee of any of the
parties' attorney or counsel connected with the
action, nor am I financially interested in the
action.

Dated this 27th day of October, 2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mayra', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

MAYRA TEXEIRA, Court Reporter

[1 - 2013]

Page 128

1	1,396 77:18	14th 105:7	64:6,19,25 66:4
1 2:21 28:5 30:7	1.310 124:25	15 35:24 76:1,2	70:14,16 71:17
35:9 41:14,15	10 61:18 63:3	76:19,22 77:9	72:20 73:3,5,10
41:17 42:12,19	65:12 72:9,20	101:1,6,21	73:24 74:6
43:1,8,13 44:7	73:23 91:19	15.3 36:19	77:22 78:7,8,9
45:21 46:2,4,8,9	96:17	16 73:7 80:25	78:12 81:4 84:4
46:11,16,19,23	10,000 7:10	101:8,9,10,10	91:18,19,21
47:2,14,16,21	100,000 8:10,11	107:5	92:3,6,7,14
47:24 48:19,24	8:13	16th 1:15 124:4	95:24 96:5,13
49:3 50:6,6,11	10:30 52:24	125:2 126:9	96:21,21,24
50:13,24,25	10:35 52:25	17 70:13 72:7,12	97:3,6,7,8,21,21
51:6,6,8,9,19	11 61:18 63:3	72:23 73:7,9,20	98:12,17,17
52:5,5,12 53:11	65:12 72:9,20	101:17 107:6	121:8
53:20,22 55:3,5	91:24 97:4	18.6 77:19	2's 96:1
55:7,10,14,17	106:13	18.7 49:1 52:4	2,108 73:25 74:5
58:11,21,24	115 2:18	52:15	20 98:6
59:3 63:19	117,281 37:11	19 98:11,15	20,000 8:17
70:14 72:21	12 75:23 78:15	19104 2:6	2003 28:11
73:14 77:23	97:14,15 113:12	1997 28:11 29:3	29:22 68:20
81:4 82:1 86:21	12099 126:19	29:9,22 81:22	81:22 113:4
86:23 87:17	123 2:21 127:9	117:9 118:23	117:9 118:23
88:6 89:14 90:4	13 67:3,8,19	119:7 120:16	119:7,23 120:3
90:6,9,18,23,24	69:23 70:1 73:7	122:10,11	120:17
91:1,7 94:8	76:3 77:2,11,18	1:00 109:20	20039 126:16
96:10 99:1,9	98:25 99:6,8,20	1:22 1:2	127:20
100:15,16 101:2	99:23 100:7,19	1:29 1:16	2013 10:20
101:3,6,10	100:25 101:21	123:24	11:15 28:13
103:6,7,8,10,12	116:9	2	29:4,9,22 30:9
113:14,16,18	13.3 52:6,16	2 30:6,25 37:9	32:16,18 34:4
114:1,23 115:1	14 76:1,2,19,22	37:10,18 39:11	36:2,11,12,13
118:3,8 121:13	77:9 98:25 99:6	39:19,19 40:5	36:25 37:3,11
121:23 122:1,5	99:10,20,24	41:18 42:15,21	37:20,23,25
122:22,23	100:15,20,25	43:16 50:4	38:6,13,14,15
123:20 127:9	14.8 36:10	61:17 62:3	38:17 39:6,16
		63:13,14,25	39:18 41:13

[2013 - 40]

Page 129

47:2,16 48:1 49:14,17,20,21 49:22 54:5 62:3 62:9,10 68:20 81:23 83:23,25 84:3 87:13,16 87:21,23 93:14 94:2 113:4 117:10 118:23 119:2,8,10,23 120:4,14,17 2018 18:21 19:12 110:9 2019 15:14,16 15:23 16:7 84:8 84:19 85:5 2020 9:12 19:1,6 22:21 31:18,19 31:19 44:20 84:5,6,9,12,13 84:20 87:6 110:7 2021 15:24 16:3 16:7 84:15,23 85:6 2022 10:19,21 11:15 25:19,22 26:18 28:14 29:15,22 31:20 31:24 36:18,21 38:17 39:6,15 39:19 41:13 43:13 46:2 48:2 48:22 49:3,14 53:4,25 62:5,9	62:10 68:14,22 71:24 79:18 80:21 85:12 86:20,23 87:6 87:13,16,21 90:4 92:16 93:3 93:7,9,10,14,15 93:16,18,25 94:2,23 96:25 98:22 99:17 102:9 104:9 110:12 112:2 116:23 119:2,11 119:16 120:14 120:18 122:4 2023 1:15 26:19 29:17,19,23 30:3 68:17 83:21 85:9,13 86:17,21 87:7 87:13,22 90:4 92:17 93:15,16 93:18 94:5,20 94:24 98:22 99:18 103:17 105:25 106:2 107:5 110:1,2 110:14 112:2 116:7,23 117:6 121:6,9,14 122:4 124:2,4 125:2 126:9,11 127:17 2024 48:21 126:20	22 12:22 27:25 54:6 92:16 93:4 23-271 82:3 83:22 86:17 116:13 235 73:24 74:2,9 74:24 75:8 24066 1:2 25 48:14,17 53:18,21 26 53:19 54:1 126:20 27 54:7 27.2 46:8,15,22 47:1 27.4 48:20 27th 124:2 126:11 127:17 29 48:17 2929 2:5 3 3 13:22 16:19,20 17:2,9 18:15 34:3 35:10 39:4 42:17 63:19,23 68:1,5 69:18,20 71:17 76:6,12 76:17,24 77:15 77:16,17,20,21 78:11 86:21,25 87:17 88:6 90:3 90:17 91:24 94:8 96:10 97:9 97:19 100:14 106:20 107:2,10	113:14,17 114:23 115:1 118:8 121:22 122:5 3,117 2:18 3-2 79:19 30 75:3 124:16 124:24 301 2:10 32301 2:11 34 39:21 106:21 35 106:24 37 39:22 4 4 35:8,10,25 36:5 42:17 44:11 45:20 53:4 54:14 55:4 55:16 57:16 63:19,22 70:18 71:11,15,15,17 72:15 73:1,5,22 74:3,4 76:6,12 76:15,17,24 77:12,23,24 78:11 86:21 87:4,9,17 88:7 89:15 90:8 94:9 96:10 113:17 114:23 115:1 118:8 120:24 122:1,5,14,21 122:22,24 40 52:19
--	---	---	---

[44.9 - ac lu]

Page 130

44.9 47:9,12,15	50,000 8:16	7th 53:23 54:2	60:3 63:4 64:8
45.2 118:11	50.3 100:8	8	84:1 89:1 104:1
450 7:5	51.9 62:4,10	8 59:22 60:2,2	abott 1:12 2:18
48.6 62:11	512 49:7 55:8	61:15 72:9,21	3:1,13,24,25
49 39:13	60:1,6,24 61:3	94:7 96:11	13:4 53:3 55:19
5	52 39:13	80 37:13 117:14	75:23 109:23
5 8:8,9,13 35:10	52.9 36:16	83,000 37:13	115:8,14 117:6
36:1,9,15,18	522 49:7 55:8	84.5 87:1	118:2 120:22
37:14 39:1	60:1,6,24 61:4	85.6 94:11	122:9 124:4
42:17 44:8	523 48:19 55:16	88.3 86:25	125:2,25 126:7
45:22 46:4,6,6	529 49:1 52:2,13	89.5 86:24 87:10	127:7
49:25 50:1,3,5,7	55:15	89.6 94:11	above 1:25
51:9,11,20 52:6	530 54:9	89.7 86:24	57:19 89:25
52:7,11 53:11	531 46:7 47:20	9	117:14 124:5
53:20,22 55:3,4	48:5,8 51:18	9 61:16 70:12	absolute 43:14
55:7,10,13,18	55:5	73:22 94:10	absolutely
58:20 60:14,16	534 64:4,18 66:9	98:1,2,3	43:20
61:18 64:1,5,7	536 64:4,18	90 52:22	academic 14:25
64:25 72:20,21	58.8 94:10	90.0 87:10	23:8
73:14 80:1 81:5	584 73:23	90.8 118:9	acceptable 86:5
87:19 88:1,9	5th 116:6	95 109:8,11	109:25
89:23 91:14	6	118:10	account 9:16,19
98:9,12,16,20	6 46:8 72:21	97 68:20 113:4	45:8 58:13 65:5
98:22 99:1,9,11	89:16,18,19,22	119:23 120:3	65:9 82:15
100:8,15 101:2	90:1,8,11	971 113:16,23	99:22,23 102:19
101:5,11,11	600 2:10	989 113:13	102:20,21
103:6,8,8,11	7	997 113:16,23	accounted
112:23 118:11	7 53:3 57:15	9:03 1:16	111:17
121:8,12,22	7.2 39:12	a	accuracy 124:8
5's 26:4,6	7.7 39:12	a.m. 1:16	accurate 5:15
5,000 7:12,21	70.1 118:9	ability 5:17	13:11 116:12
5.4 52:16	71.1 47:17,19	able 8:12 11:6	accurately 4:15
50 113:24	78 113:13	13:7 25:6 55:20	116:20
117:16		56:8 58:3 59:24	ac lu 2:14

[acs - answers]

Page 131

<p>acs 10:16 11:1 15:24,24 16:4,7 act 34:7,11,14 action 127:15 127:16 activity 20:15 actual 16:16 17:11 19:17 75:4 actually 55:4 87:12 90:21 113:9 117:2 add 77:17 91:20 91:23 96:25 97:1 added 13:14 76:3 77:10 91:19 113:16 addition 76:3 77:1 92:1 98:9 108:14 additional 11:5 13:16,16,17,18 27:1 77:22 94:21 additions 13:12 address 6:7 16:16 17:1,12 17:18,20,21 18:7,9 56:6 70:5 82:6 114:13,16 addressed 82:13 addresses 11:2 16:13,14 18:2 69:13,15</p>	<p>addressing 114:4 adequate 79:1 adhered 114:22 114:25 adjacent 73:6 adjustments 43:5 adopted 56:5 advantage 113:18 114:5 affect 98:18,19 affiliations 20:23 age 32:23 35:20 35:22 40:25 47:10,13,20,24 48:20 49:2,10 52:6,10 59:2 60:11 61:20 63:11 76:7,18 77:2 83:14,14 100:8 101:7 117:15 118:8,10 118:21 agenda 22:4 agendas 21:25 agree 6:23 15:16 20:3,10 20:25 22:3,7 30:16 32:21 41:14 43:5 57:21,22 71:1 72:6,10 77:12 80:22 83:21</p>	<p>85:15 86:20 92:1 100:7 101:2,17 107:2 111:13 112:24 113:20 121:7 agreed 79:7 ahead 29:25 39:3 47:18 al 1:4 124:3 125:1 aligned 20:4 alter 110:3 alterations 106:11 alternative 19:15 27:5,10 27:13 28:3 30:22 38:8 78:13,15 81:1,9 81:10,18 100:11 100:14 104:10 114:16 118:3 120:25 alternatives 37:21 american 10:16 15:14,16 84:6,9 84:12,16,23 amount 7:15 8:3 8:7 analyses 48:9 64:13 65:23 115:5 analysis 11:9,11 15:5,6,8,10,12</p>	<p>19:4 23:17,18 24:12 27:7 35:5 38:14 40:1,3 41:9,12 43:18 44:12 47:8 51:4 51:13 60:20 64:20 65:19 72:19 76:5 77:25 80:8,17 82:19 88:4 93:21 103:18 107:16 110:24 111:10,13 115:17 118:14 118:16,22 119:3 119:20,21 120:1 120:5 121:4,18 123:2,5,10 analyze 11:6 14:17 15:4 27:17 103:22 analyzed 24:9 118:4 120:19 analyzing 10:10 53:4 83:3 answer 4:13,16 4:23,25 5:1,7,8 5:9 6:9 7:23 23:15 74:17 83:10,12 85:25 91:10 95:11 97:5 105:14 answering 4:18 answers 4:11</p>
---	--	---	---

[antisocialist - aware]

Page 132

antisocialist 21:25 22:3	89:14,15,18,19 89:22 90:1,8,10	76:6,8,11,23 78:2,4,5,7 81:15	asking 4:10 7:14 7:16 86:8,9
apart 103:21	90:10 91:19,21	86:15 89:8 90:2	aspect 114:15
apologize 89:19	91:24 96:17	90:3,17 92:5,20	assess 38:19
appear 72:7 116:16	97:2,4,6,14,15 97:18,19,20	94:8 95:5,6,19	123:11
appearances 2:1	98:1,2,3,4,6,9	95:21 96:7,9,12	assessing 110:13
appeared 126:8	98:11,15,25	99:20,23 100:23	assessment 112:2
appendix 48:12 84:14	99:8,10 100:7 100:15,25,25	101:20,21 102:1	associated 21:18 22:4
applied 15:11	101:1,6,8,10	102:22 103:4,16	assume 4:16
apply 34:7	103:1,3,6,20	103:18,22	assumes 41:17
applying 82:23	104:14 105:20	104:21,22,24	assuming 119:9
appropriate 78:20 82:22 83:6	105:22,24 106:21,23,23,24 107:3,5,6	107:18,19,21 121:15	attached 12:5 124:10
approval 25:19 25:22	108:23 109:4 122:18,19,21	argument 19:15 59:13 70:18 116:18	attention 33:15
arch 2:5	areas 9:22 24:14	article 15:7 69:2	attorney 124:12 127:12,14
area 24:15 46:8 51:14,19 53:19 59:8,22 60:2,2,5 60:13 61:17 63:3 65:12 66:2 66:9,11 67:3,5,8 67:11,12,14,19 67:20 68:3 69:23 70:1,13 71:11 72:7,9,9 72:12,20,21,23 73:9,20 76:1,2,3 76:19,22 77:1,2 77:9,11,18 78:3 78:7,9,10,12 82:13 89:13,14	24:22 31:1,3 40:4,17 42:15 49:12,25 50:5,7 50:8,19,20,23 51:9,11 53:16 53:20 54:15,17 54:19,24 55:6 55:16 57:16 58:5,23,25 59:1 59:19 60:23 61:3,16,21,24 61:25 63:2,20 63:25 64:24 65:2 66:11 67:12,15 72:19 73:4,6,6 75:25	articles 11:16 11:17,18,24 15:3 ascertain 89:23 asked 4:17,18 6:20 10:15,21 15:25 16:1 22:23 23:23 34:24 35:6,18 62:15 83:9,12 83:13 84:21 86:19 92:25 93:1,2,6,7,11,18 95:8 103:24 107:17,18 112:11 114:16 121:3	attorneys 8:18 26:10 audibly 5:9 authorized 127:5 available 6:20 84:17 85:1 121:7 124:5 aware 22:11,15 26:9,12,14 28:2 34:13 35:12,19 35:22 38:18,22 43:23 44:15 57:5,7 63:14 69:21 86:10 109:7 122:4

[b - called]

Page 133

b	begins 48:13	49:13,25 50:1	bottom 34:2
b 2:19	behalf 1:22 2:4	50:11,21 51:10	39:2 61:15
back 4:24 10:12	2:8	51:10,21,21	69:22 70:1
15:21 28:5 30:6	belief 33:23	52:6,10,15,16	73:22 94:7
30:7 40:9 47:18	believe 8:17	58:18,23 59:2,5	96:11 113:12
50:24 52:24	9:14 14:22 15:3	60:11,13 61:20	boundaries 24:8
53:3 63:3 73:12	17:21 18:21,25	64:5 65:15 80:1	24:18 63:21,22
91:19,21,24	26:4 28:12	80:3 87:19 88:2	63:23 67:1
96:6 97:20	35:24 53:16	98:15 99:8,10	71:21 106:14,17
109:20	70:24 71:25	99:12,17 100:8	106:19 118:18
background	88:17 112:6	100:9,17 101:3	122:16
9:24 108:18	122:13	101:7,12,12	boundary 66:1
backtracking	benchmark	108:24 112:23	118:22 119:20
93:5	32:10,14,15	117:15,17,23	120:1,5
ballpark 7:6 8:7	37:20 38:10,19	118:10	bounds 74:22
based 9:22 11:8	38:24 49:17	block 60:20	break 5:24 6:3,5
25:13 27:11	54:5 86:18	65:17	6:10 52:21,24
28:24 30:25	best 5:2 55:22	blocks 24:10,13	75:20 87:11
32:19 34:15	beth 3:24	24:20	103:5 109:16
51:4 68:8 72:4	better 111:1	blood 5:23 6:4	breakdowns
73:18 79:2	beyond 10:9	blue 60:12	58:16 62:1
90:19 92:4,14	34:4	bolster 19:16	briefly 19:7
92:15 99:21,21	big 5:6	book 13:15	bring 63:3
102:15 103:13	biggest 68:24	boost 50:1,12	broken 64:7,7
104:2,13 111:14	billed 7:18,20	boosted 47:13	bronough 2:10
113:21 116:2	7:21 8:2	49:10 52:10,11	bump 111:7
bases 78:16	bit 42:24 61:9	border 28:22	bureau 108:8
basis 28:10,18	88:24 89:5 93:5	50:19 54:23	bvap 46:10,19
31:3 33:8,9 53:7	black 29:12	59:18,19 76:12	46:23 50:12
57:17 62:20	34:15,21 35:1,3	76:14	byproduct 28:8
73:21 79:3,4	35:10,22 36:2	borders 40:19	119:14
94:1 95:12,13	36:10,13,17,21	59:21 65:15,16	c
95:16 116:18	36:24 39:10,18	76:6 105:9,11	called 3:14
bathroom 6:3	41:6 46:8 47:1,2	105:20,21 109:1	122:19
	48:20 49:2,10		

[calls - cohesion]

Page 134

calls 85:23 camera 3:3 campaigns 21:20,23 candidate 29:11 29:12 34:15,21 35:2 79:6 110:25 117:17 candidates 21:16,24 22:11 22:16 79:13 116:3 capacity 23:4 88:14 capturing 66:2 66:11 carolyn 1:12 2:18 3:13,24,24 124:4 125:2,25 126:7 127:7 carve 66:3 case 1:2 3:21 6:13,21,24 8:19 9:3,4,9,9,11 10:4,13 25:7 77:6 88:15,22 118:5 cause 1:25 3:8 census 9:12 10:15,25 14:13 14:18 44:20 84:6 center 2:5 certain 5:7 9:22 83:8 116:3	certainly 8:15 8:16,16 49:24 113:25 certificate 126:1 127:1 certify 126:7 127:5,11 chance 45:16 change 30:14,16 33:20 37:6 38:10 46:14 50:17,18 90:21 94:2 101:4,17 125:4,7,10,13 125:16 changed 28:21 28:23 37:5 98:22 99:18 114:18 116:15 changes 10:20 30:8,10 32:4,5,5 32:6,10,14,17 32:19 38:3,4 41:13 43:12 44:6,7 46:13,20 47:3,6 49:15,18 50:25 57:23 58:4 62:21 72:6 72:22 83:19 88:25 90:14,18 90:25 91:6,12 91:17 92:3,14 93:4,8,9,20 94:23 97:12,13 97:14 99:5,17	99:20 100:6 101:20 102:11 102:15 103:23 104:2,19 106:8 107:4 110:1,1 116:15,22 120:20 124:8 chat 12:10 checks 8:4 chosen 57:16 chris 42:7 christopher 2:6 8:21 124:1 christopher.m... 124:1 cira 2:5 circumstances 69:3 82:21 83:5 117:21 cited 108:1 citizen 83:14 city 1:7 3:21 6:21 9:12,13 11:1 16:12 19:14 21:4,13 23:18,20,24 24:4,8,15 28:7 29:21 30:19 34:3 35:20,23 36:14 42:20 44:19,24 50:19 56:4,11 57:5,8 60:10 61:11 63:21,22,23 65:7 67:21	71:12 72:2,14 80:10 81:22 82:13 83:16 85:15 86:9 88:5 94:20 105:9,19 105:21 106:16 106:25 107:24 108:4 110:25 111:4,6 112:7 114:10,11,22,25 115:3,23 116:14 119:13,22 124:3 125:1 city's 12:3 23:18 34:7,15 82:2 105:16 106:4,7 112:5 116:13 122:15 civil 124:24,24 claim 19:15 114:3,3 clarify 10:5 51:2 96:6 clean 66:12 clear 27:2 29:2 34:5 77:24 close 51:15,15 54:17,20 closely 20:4 closer 64:18 coast 63:15,24 code 106:16,25 108:4 cohesion 57:11 123:11
--	--	--	---

[collected - conclusion]

Page 135

collected 15:9 collecting 10:9 collectively 94:8 colloquy 4:21 column 45:22 45:22 46:3,4 come 4:23 6:12 11:8 119:9 comes 62:19 111:23 comfortable 118:15 coming 69:1 commenced 13:19 23:17 68:14 comments 26:18 27:1 commission 9:14 11:1 16:12 19:14 21:13 25:17 26:9,11 26:16 28:7,9,16 28:17,19 43:4 56:4 57:5,8 61:12 70:22 72:3,14 78:23 78:24 81:3,8 82:13 85:15 86:2,9,11 88:5 94:20 105:7 111:1,4 115:23 116:2,14 119:14 119:15,18 120:8 126:19	commission's 33:6 42:21 71:22 91:20 105:10,18 114:10,11 commissioner 16:20 17:1,8 18:12 25:21 26:3,5 67:25 69:3 71:23 79:25 111:7,15 commissioner's 17:18 26:6 68:23 commissioners 17:14 20:7,20 21:1,5 25:20,25 67:21 69:16 70:19 78:24 79:7,13,16 80:5 85:8 110:15 communicated 8:18,20,21 communities 56:17 community 10:16 15:15,16 84:7,9,12,16,24 compact 85:16 85:21 86:3,5,10 86:12 compactness 56:15,21 57:6,9 61:10,12	comparator 38:1 compare 31:25 32:2 37:3,4 38:11,16 54:22 83:25 84:3 93:1 107:18 compared 30:10 31:15 32:6 37:12 38:4 52:16,17 59:5 61:21,25 65:2 86:16 87:13,16 99:11 101:14 111:2 119:2,10 comparing 37:3 39:6,15,17,17 49:19,21 60:9 72:20 82:4 87:5 87:22 101:24 comparison 37:19 39:5,8 49:16,22 54:2,4 64:18 90:5 102:3,7 comparisons 32:9 38:24 54:21,24 58:6 compensated 7:1 complete 127:10 completed 124:15 completely 33:18 45:6	completeness 39:3 composition 39:4 40:16 70:17 72:4 81:21 91:15 96:1,24 97:2,3 98:19,21 100:4 103:7,11 107:19 107:20 compositions 70:20,23 71:2 81:3,13 computer 42:1 concentrated 40:4 63:18 94:12 95:4 concentrations 40:13 concerning 8:19 67:8 109:3 concerns 9:16 9:19,23 19:17 86:14 concluded 119:3 123:24 concluding 28:18 conclusion 29:14 31:1 67:14 85:24 91:3 95:1,13 99:14,19 104:4 116:10,20,22 118:1,24 119:5
---	--	--	---

[conclusion - counsel]

Page 136

120:7,16 conclusions 11:8 25:8,10 32:13,17,19 51:5 65:23 77:8 80:13,18 82:19 93:2,8,19 94:16 95:9,10,14,15 95:17,18 97:12 97:24 98:3,8,14 99:4,15 104:12 105:21 112:3 116:5 123:6 conducted 11:21 72:19 111:11 confidence 74:21 configuration 114:23 115:1 121:16 122:1 configure 122:5 conflict 68:11 confusing 4:10 connect 76:17 connected 127:14 consensus 69:1 conservative 20:7 consider 82:22 83:6 109:4 considerably 106:15	consideration 16:22 35:3,7 78:20 79:9 80:15 100:11 considerations 9:23 25:12,14 32:20 67:11 116:17,19 considered 8:24 29:4,4 33:24 37:21 38:9 69:13,15 100:5 124:17 considering 111:15 constituents 20:21 21:2,6 constitutional 85:20 construction 109:8,10 consultant 26:13,13 106:4 106:7 contacted 6:14 6:16 contained 13:9 15:6,7 17:22 51:16 77:18 contains 13:11 73:23,24 context 114:20 contiguous 66:20,20	continue 116:16 continued 28:23 continues 117:7 contract 13:15 control 114:6 controls 42:6,10 convention 108:7 conveyed 56:10 copies 124:14 copy 12:12 123:19 core 24:17,21 50:21,22 57:11 70:22 71:2,4,15 72:3 114:19 cores 25:2 28:20 38:1 40:21 71:21 80:23 corner 76:16 78:1 correct 13:21 17:15,16 18:17 18:18 19:22 21:14,15 22:1 27:8,15 29:13 29:15,16 36:22 37:15 39:7 40:19 41:6,7,10 41:11,15,25 44:13 46:19,25 47:10,11,14,21 47:22,25 48:1,3 48:18,22 49:4,5 49:8,11 52:8	54:10,13 55:5 55:17,18 56:19 56:25 57:3,25 58:1 59:3,4 60:17 61:13,14 62:6,22 63:21 66:15 69:14 70:6,10 71:5,8 71:12,18 73:15 74:7,16 76:20 77:14 80:15,16 80:19,20 81:8 83:3,4 85:13,14 85:21 87:17,18 87:20,22,24 88:3 92:18 94:3 97:25 100:17 101:8,13,14,18 101:23,25 104:3 104:9,13,15 106:4 107:7 112:3,4,13 114:2 115:6 117:11,19 118:5 118:6,25 119:18 119:19,23 120:8 120:12 121:4 correctly 41:3 45:21 59:12 76:2 102:14,16 119:8 counsel 4:20 11:19 15:25 16:14 18:5 27:15 38:23
---	--	--	---

[counsel - depends]

Page 137

70:9 83:10 84:21 86:19 88:18 106:7,22 107:14 127:12 127:14 counter 32:1 58:7,10 county 19:6,24 20:1 22:21,24 115:2 126:3 127:2 couple 10:6 course 7:8 8:5 112:10 court 1:1 3:1,6 4:4,13 5:12 82:7 82:12 123:18 126:5,17 127:4 127:21 court's 82:9 courts 38:18 cover 68:16,19 69:2 71:8 covers 71:11 creating 5:8 credence 64:21 criteria 56:6,8 57:6 71:4 90:19 92:4,15 99:21 103:2 104:13 critical 89:15 91:20,23 criticism 82:6 criticized 82:12	cross 2:17 115:12 cue 20:14 current 12:6 46:23 119:10,25 currently 30:2 106:9 cursor 67:20 78:1 cut 114:24 cv 1:2 12:5,7,20 13:9 14:8 d d 2:16,19 53:11 53:11,20,20,22 53:22 55:3,3,4,5 55:7,7,10,10,13 55:14,17,18 dade 126:3 127:2 damage 113:25 data 8:24 9:6 10:9,10,15,25 11:2,5,6,7,12 14:13,17,18 15:5,8,17,24,24 15:25 16:2,4,7 18:1,2,3 26:25 27:3,12 40:9 41:9 51:5 65:4 65:10 70:7,8 77:9 80:18 82:19,23 83:3,7 83:14 84:6,8,10 84:13,16,21	85:4 93:8 112:3 112:6 113:9,11 dataverse 18:17 date 7:2,3 13:10 40:12 124:11 125:25 dated 116:6 127:17 day 126:11 127:17 days 124:16 de 26:13,14,17 105:8,16,23 106:3,10,14,18 106:22,25 107:20,21 dealing 75:2 decades 28:8,16 28:21 119:15 dechert 2:5 dechert.com 124:1 decided 61:12 decision 51:17 51:18 57:12 75:11 83:8 91:20,23 103:14 104:2 decisions 53:6 66:13 92:24 104:8 declare 125:20 decrease 37:8 37:18 87:1	decreased 36:21 36:24 39:11 46:10 decreases 61:9 defendant 1:8 1:22 2:8 defendant's 2:20 123:20 definition 105:3 105:5,16,16,18 106:17,22,24 107:1,20,22 108:25 definitions 104:25 107:23 107:24 108:1,8 108:13 degree 58:17 deliberately 53:6 57:17 democrat 21:18 21:19 24:25 80:1,2 110:6 democratic 25:21 26:2 democrats 20:8 22:18 department 108:6 dependent 75:13 depending 108:25 depends 27:9,9 37:2 46:12,20
---	--	---	---

[depends - district]

Page 138

71:19 75:14 depicted 107:4 depiction 75:25 113:8,10 depicts 39:4 deposed 4:1 deposing 124:12 deposition 1:10 1:25 4:7 115:15 115:16 123:23 127:7 desantis 110:22 111:3,9 describe 57:19 68:22 90:14 described 14:19 72:22 83:2 99:14 describing 72:18 description 2:20 39:9 53:19 58:9 106:17 designation 106:1 designed 73:17 116:16 detail 17:14 detailed 11:25 14:8 55:11 101:20 determine 10:18 69:16 83:16 determining 102:25	diabetic 5:22 dialogue 62:19 differ 67:10 70:15,16 73:9 76:22 differed 73:17 73:18 difference 16:7 16:10 40:25 52:15,17,18 62:9 74:18 77:14 91:15 100:22 105:15 121:25 differences 93:11,17 different 10:7 16:8,9 33:12,13 43:3 56:24 57:2 58:16 62:12 72:12 85:5 89:8 92:20 94:24 99:25 100:3,4 102:22 103:3,15 104:5 107:8 121:10,11,12 differs 82:3 difficult 5:11 direct 2:17 3:17 12:16 38:23 directed 57:8 direction 96:2,3 101:22 directions 56:5	directives 112:20 directly 70:14 73:6 96:13 discuss 27:20 109:10 discussed 72:8 73:14 123:1 discussing 89:8 discussion 13:2 disparities 67:4 disparity 64:22 65:25 66:14 dissimilarities 97:11 distinction 22:19 district 1:1,1 16:13,19,20 17:2,9 18:12,14 24:11 25:2 26:4 26:6 31:2,18 34:14,19,25 35:4,10 36:1,1,9 36:9,15,18,21 37:9,10,14,18 39:11,19,19 40:5,22 41:1,6,6 41:14,15,17,18 42:12,15,16,17 42:18,19,21,22 43:1,8,11,13,15 43:16 44:7,8 45:10,18,21,22 46:2,4,4,6,6,8,9	46:11,16,19,23 47:2,7,14,16,21 47:24 48:19,23 48:24 49:3,11 49:13,25 50:1,3 50:4,5,6,6,7,11 50:13,24,25 51:6,6,8,9,9,11 51:19,20 52:5,5 52:6,7,11,12,13 57:10 58:11,20 58:21,24 59:3 60:14,16 61:17 61:18 62:3,3,13 62:20,25 63:13 63:14,15,23,25 64:1,5,6,7,19,19 64:25,25 66:4 68:1,5 69:4,18 69:20 70:14,16 70:18 71:11,15 71:15 72:15 73:1,3,5,5,10,14 73:14,22,24 74:3,4,6,12 75:9 76:6,6,12,12,15 76:17,17,24,24 77:12,15,16,17 77:20,21,22,23 77:23,24 78:8,8 78:9,9,11,11,12 80:1,23 85:16 85:21 86:3,6,12 86:23,25 87:1,9 87:19 88:1,2,9
---	--	---	---

[district - drawing]

Page 139

89:14,15,16	24:18 25:1,13	118:7,19,25	115:8,14 117:6
90:4,6,8,9,18,23	25:16 28:20	119:6,22 122:5	118:2 120:22
90:24 91:1,7,18	29:10 30:15,17	122:22	122:9 124:4
91:18,19,21,24	31:4,7 32:7,11	districtwide	125:2,25 126:7
92:3,6,7,14	32:14,15,18,22	94:1	127:7
94:11 95:3,24	32:24,25 33:11	dl 126:24	draft 53:23,24
96:1,5,13,21,21	33:12 34:4,8	doctor 3:19	drafted 10:6
96:24 97:3,6,7,8	35:9,9,12,15	65:11 85:25	54:3
97:8,9,19,21,21	37:12 38:2	102:24 109:14	draw 26:11 32:9
98:9,12,12,16	40:15,22 41:4,5	document 55:20	32:13,17 69:17
98:17,17,18,20	42:16,18,24,25	125:21	71:20 77:7
98:22 99:1,1,9,9	43:21,25 45:13	doing 5:13,14	85:20 86:2,5,11
99:11 100:8,8	45:24 46:1	17:19 25:18	91:2 93:2,7,18
100:14,15,15,16	57:12 59:20	50:9 64:12	98:2,8,13 99:4
100:17 101:3,5	62:1,23 63:19	80:17 113:25	99:14,15 104:11
101:6,7,9,9,10	64:9 69:17,18	dollar 7:15 8:3	107:10 114:1
101:11,11,12,23	70:20,23 71:5	8:7	122:14
103:1,1,6,6,10	71:17 72:4,20	dollars 8:1	drawer 44:16
103:11,12,12	72:21 78:17,17	donate 43:1	44:21,24
110:16 111:16	78:18,19,22	donated 61:19	drawers 33:14
112:7,22,23,23	81:4,4,16,17,19	donor 50:8 92:7	56:5,11 57:9
113:14,14,16,18	83:18 86:21	92:21 97:18	drawing 6:22
114:1,2,19	87:17,24 88:5,6	100:1	25:15 26:11
116:2,3 117:23	91:14 92:7,20	download 14:17	29:5 33:15,25
118:11 120:12	92:21,22 93:10	18:19	36:20 42:14
121:8,8,12,13	94:8,11,21,25	downloaded	44:16,22 45:17
121:16,22,23	95:7,20,22	10:25 11:3,6	47:8 56:7,12
122:1,1,14,21	96:10 98:5 99:4	18:16	57:9 59:14
122:23,24	100:2,21 102:11	downtown	64:17 65:7 66:7
districting 28:7	102:23 103:4	121:23	66:8 68:12,14
119:14	110:3 111:1	dr 1:12 2:18 3:1	68:17,19 94:16
districts 6:22	112:6,22 113:1	3:13 11:4 13:4	95:2,9 97:24
9:14,15,18	113:2,5,17	19:5 22:20 53:3	99:21 102:16
19:16 20:10	114:17,23 115:1	55:19 75:23	106:7,8 111:17
23:21,24 24:1,9	117:11,14,18,22	88:11,21 109:23	

[drawn - exacerbation]

Page 140

drawn 9:15,19 19:16 20:10 23:3,7 30:20 32:22 34:20 35:1,13 61:8,10 67:6,15 68:4 69:19 88:5 91:7 92:4 113:5 114:17 118:19 draws 85:16 drew 60:10 94:20 105:19,21 116:5 drill 64:13 drop 62:12,16 dropbox 12:9 dropped 32:23 dropping 6:4 due 39:20 duly 3:14 126:9 duties 56:7	easy 79:5 effect 46:24 95:23 96:20 efforts 82:6 either 26:18 46:5,9 47:20 52:7 63:24 72:25 76:23 85:5 86:20 91:16 95:2 103:7 110:12 111:2,8 116:1 117:22 119:23 elect 29:11,12 116:3 elected 70:5 election 14:18 15:4,11 18:16 18:20,23 19:1,2 19:3,18,21 22:21 79:7 110:8,10 111:7 elections 19:14 21:9 78:25 79:3 110:8,15,17 111:5,14,24 115:23 electoral 20:15 80:11 emergency 6:7 employee 127:12,13 enacted 10:20 10:21 11:15 20:17 28:7	29:22 30:2,9 43:13 46:2 53:25 54:3,6 62:5 71:24 79:19 80:21 81:1,7 119:13 enactment 85:13 endorse 22:9 engaged 15:19 enhancing 113:18 enjoined 25:19 25:22,23 27:25 28:13 82:4,7,10 83:19,23,24 86:17 87:6 94:10 95:21 107:4 116:15 enlarge 55:24 entire 24:15 27:3 66:8 entirely 122:15 122:21 entirety 113:14 116:11 equal 36:1,10 46:25 47:12 equality 32:4 equivalent 56:21 errata 124:10 124:12,15 esquire 2:6,11 2:14 124:1	estimate 15:17 15:17 74:14,15 74:21,23,23,24 84:13,16 estimates 15:15 16:9 74:16 84:7 84:24 estimating 74:20 et 1:4 124:3 125:1 ethnic 9:23 23:25 24:3,6 25:12,13 32:20 34:16 79:24 116:17 ethnicity 9:17 9:20 28:24 43:7 58:16 62:19 80:4 110:18,21 evaluating 104:19 everyone's 8:22 evidence 19:18 45:8 exacerbate 36:25 72:15 exacerbated 31:8,10 32:25 49:16 exacerbating 72:22 exacerbation 31:23
e			
e 2:16,19,19 15:22 56:16 88:17,19 124:12 124:14,24,25 125:3,3,3 earlier 14:19 62:18 68:7 120:6 early 11:13 easier 12:13 east 60:19,21,24 61:4			

[exact - first]

Page 141

exact 8:7 17:11 38:6 73:13 107:8 exactly 14:14 27:25 96:7 exaggerate 35:13 exaggerated 35:9 examination 3:17 19:21 31:1 41:8 115:12 117:4 examine 21:8 53:10 66:25 104:8 110:14 examined 3:15 21:10 30:3 35:5 38:18 122:3 examining 24:19 73:4 example 16:19 64:17 examples 33:4 excel 18:4 except 28:22 97:5 103:19,19 exchange 113:15 exchanged 99:3 100:2 excluded 106:25 107:21 exclusively 80:18 82:18	exercise 23:8 exhibit 2:21 123:20 exhibited 34:5 exist 86:11 existed 28:21 existing 38:2 46:15 47:23 57:11 72:22 80:23 81:2,13 81:20 expansive 106:24 expect 50:10,12 experience 14:6 26:10 expert 6:12,21 6:23 10:14 11:4 12:20 41:22 93:22 104:4 expires 126:20 explain 9:20 10:19 45:4 66:14 67:5 83:17 89:17 explained 45:17 explanation 15:6,7 27:10,11 70:25 78:16 79:2 109:25 110:14 114:17 explanations 27:6,14 78:14 83:8	explored 35:17 extent 9:10 10:19 22:18 24:17 30:21 83:17 85:23 eyes 55:22 f fact 17:18 39:20 78:18 79:2,18 factor 11:24 20:9 51:1 57:10 58:4 79:12 80:14 91:8 95:13 111:21,23 factored 79:21 115:5 factors 82:22 93:20 102:25 facts 8:23 9:2 125:21 factual 94:13,15 94:17,18 95:2 95:15 97:23 98:1,7,13 99:2 99:13,16 fails 124:19 fair 4:18 5:3 6:10 7:17 43:1 49:17 58:4 65:7 82:17 112:8 fall 45:18 101:21 familiar 34:10 far 106:5	feasible 56:18 features 86:13 february 53:23 54:2 federal 124:17 124:24 feel 6:4 92:3,13 118:15 field 15:11 figure 17:2,5 40:13 47:9 64:14 79:5 106:20 107:2,10 figures 121:19 file 18:2,3 filed 120:24 files 11:7 64:15 70:7,8 final 25:19 109:17,23 finalized 69:7 financially 127:15 find 23:2 50:20 59:19 108:2 finding 16:21 fine 12:18 89:10 finish 4:12 first 3:14 10:14 13:24 15:19 28:12 30:7 48:10 53:21 55:6 61:17 69:7 73:8 75:24 80:14 82:18
---	--	---	--

[first - governor's]

Page 142

84:4,7,20 85:11 89:13 93:22 104:17 119:13 five 15:15,17 23:12 29:9 52:21 53:5,13 62:23 84:7,13 84:16,24 109:16 119:6 fl 124:13 flagami 122:19 122:25 123:1 flip 28:5 34:2 70:12 82:1 florida 1:1,24 2:11 124:18,24 126:3,6,18 127:2 follow 117:2 followed 119:17 following 67:1 follows 3:16 footsteps 119:18 foregoing 125:21 127:9 forgive 75:3 form 7:14 85:22 105:13 formalities 123:25 format 4:10 18:3 former 70:13 forming 8:24 9:25 14:7 26:22	found 108:14 four 28:3 70:19 framed 77:5 front 13:5 41:21 41:24 42:1 122:7 fulfill 10:23 full 3:22 39:1 fully 111:16 functional 56:21 further 15:13 31:4,7 50:1 60:16 97:24 98:3 99:15 113:12 116:25 127:11	geographical 54:18 86:13 geographically 59:16 60:5,9 66:20 geography 63:7 64:14 65:5,9 71:3,6 george 2:11 3:20 5:21 7:13 12:11 42:5 52:20 75:21 89:4,11 109:20 115:11 gerrymander 81:24 117:8 gerrymandering 78:21 getting 5:15 33:4 47:18 101:23 give 3:8 8:3 12:8 22:13 42:15,18 42:24 64:21 120:22 given 4:3 26:15 27:19 28:11 50:4 61:18 64:5 72:25 73:1 74:4 81:10,11 98:16 99:25 100:2 110:16 112:14 112:15 118:11 119:3	glance 28:12 glucose 5:25 gmcvb 106:16 go 4:6 12:21,25 15:1,21 16:21 17:19 29:25 39:3 40:9 47:5 56:12 60:16 96:6 goals 75:14 114:10,12 god 3:10 goes 41:8 going 4:6,16 5:6 5:23 12:8,9 30:7 31:23 38:7 41:5 44:19 47:7 53:3 53:14 55:19 56:3 59:23 61:13 63:7 66:8 75:19,24 88:24 88:25 100:20 103:8 116:10 117:18 120:23 good 3:19 21:1 52:22 54:21 58:6,7 72:16 75:21 109:19 government 3:4 20:15 governor 110:22 111:2,9 governor's 18:20 19:2,12 19:13
	g		
	gain 37:14 41:15 42:12 71:16 73:5 gained 37:17,17 43:19 gathered 14:4 general 15:11 17:10 67:19 generally 15:9 22:4 40:20 43:9 80:22 107:3 121:6 generals 9:3,8,9 9:11 geographic 24:7 39:23 65:1,2 76:6		

[grace - impacted]

Page 143

grace 1:4 124:3 125:1 grandy 26:13,14 105:23 106:3 grandy's 26:17 105:8,16 106:10 106:14,18,22,25 107:20,21 grants 13:18 granular 41:9 gray 2:9 3:20 greater 36:1,10 61:20 73:2 108:7 greatest 13:8 ground 4:7,8 group 74:9 grouping 94:12 95:3 groups 107:25 growing 43:14 gubernatorial 110:10 guess 8:14 17:13 28:15 38:7 50:9 55:1 59:7 65:11 76:25 102:24 106:3,17	happened 47:4 harvard's 11:3 18:17 head 5:9,10 66:24 hear 16:24 114:24 heard 34:12 heavier 77:2 help 3:10 4:13 33:3 helpful 22:24 23:1 55:25 hh 126:19 high 90:11 98:4 98:5 99:10 108:23 higher 46:15,17 46:22 47:1,15 48:20 49:2,12 51:21,21 58:23 59:2,4 60:11,13 64:5 88:6 99:8 101:7 highlighted 90:2,12,14 highlighting 90:1,20 highly 28:24 hired 26:10 hispanic 29:11 32:21,22 35:19 39:12,18 41:5 43:11 47:19,24 49:11 50:12	52:11 61:20 62:2 63:18 72:15 73:2,17 73:18 76:7,18 86:22,24,25 87:9,17 88:6 90:12 94:9,12 94:21,22,25 95:4,7,19,20 96:4,21 97:1,20 98:4,5 99:10 100:9,16,17 101:4,12 110:25 111:6,15,16 112:22 117:14 117:22 118:8 hispanics 35:10 historic 29:3 105:9,11 106:15 106:22 107:1,23 108:22,24 historical 12:2 108:18 112:6 122:3 history 109:7 hold 20:22 holding 3:2 home 68:24 69:4,18,19 homes 68:1 69:16 hourly 7:4 hours 7:6,14 8:1 housing 63:7	hypothetical 32:1 103:9 hypothetically 66:10 hypotheticals 58:7,10
i			
h 2:19 125:3 half 59:9 66:21 halfway 53:21 hand 3:7 handful 11:17 11:18			idea 7:25 21:4,7 32:24 38:15 63:9 identical 20:18 identification 3:4 123:21 126:23,24 identified 35:9 53:5,5,14 54:12 55:3 59:1 73:20 79:18 90:16 identify 58:3 59:7 64:1,9 123:11 identities 109:12 identity 3:5 ideology 20:4,16 20:22 21:2,5 79:10,12,15 ignored 33:18 44:24 immediately 76:23 impact 57:13 65:22 impacted 48:11

[impacting - know]

Page 144

impacting 65:6	incumbents	inland 63:20,23	issuing 112:13
impair 5:17	18:13 69:17	inquiring 95:14	j
impermissible	indicate 18:15	inquisition 6:2	j 2:6
81:23	45:12,23 82:2	insight 111:10	job 72:16
imply 119:16	84:5 99:20	insofar 24:9	joined 80:2
important 18:8	indicated 22:20	inspection	joining 42:16
18:10 19:11	43:15 57:16	119:1	joint 109:12
22:22 26:21	68:7 75:5	instance 51:17	journals 14:25
44:21 65:18	indicates 61:16	58:19	judgments 77:7
impression	indicating 66:1	instructed 4:23	july 116:6
95:11	66:9,11 67:20	16:3 56:11	jumping 41:12
improper 28:25	89:14 97:16	insulin 5:22	june 105:7
29:7	122:18	intended 70:22	126:20
improperly 29:4	indication 20:16	intending 6:1	k
inadequate	indicative 78:19	intentionally	keep 43:21,24
27:11	90:19 102:15	33:23	keeping 44:3
include 60:15	103:13 104:13	interchanged	71:15 123:7
69:10	individual	50:8	kept 47:21
included 48:21	10:17 40:8,21	interest 56:18	kerri 8:21
49:3 68:5 69:14	81:3 83:15	interested	kind 78:1 93:5
73:21 88:18	104:8,14,15	127:15	kmm 1:2
107:19,22	individuals	interesting 58:9	know 6:5,15 7:3
inconsistent	37:12 73:24	internal 40:22	7:23 8:4 13:8
52:9	74:24,25	interval 74:22	16:11,20,25
incorporated	inform 67:18	introductory	17:5,8 21:11,16
59:13	68:3	28:6	21:22 23:11,15
increase 46:18	information	investigating	25:24 26:6
increased 39:21	9:25 17:25 18:7	14:12	27:25 30:2
46:10	18:9 22:22	invited 13:17	33:14,17 34:1,9
increasing	24:19 26:21	involves 101:17	34:17 35:16
46:24	56:10 65:6	involving 90:18	36:11,12,17
incumbent 11:2	informed 70:2	irrelevant 27:7	39:8,23 40:7
16:13,14 18:7,9	inherited 30:11	issued 3:4 123:6	41:17 44:23
18:11 69:13	34:4	issues 79:9	45:19 46:12,14

[know - looking]

Page 145

48:5 51:14 54:19 56:16 60:5,23 61:1,3 62:14 63:1,8,9 65:8,18 66:5,22 67:16,17 69:5,5 71:6,21,23,25 72:5 73:20 75:16 76:20 79:15,19,23,25 80:2,4 82:5 84:15,18,23,25 85:1,3,4,7,8,10 88:18 91:10 98:21 100:24 105:5,15 107:12 109:1 110:21 113:2 114:11 116:11 121:17 121:19,21,21 122:7,24 knowledge 14:4 14:6 22:1,2 115:4,7 known 6:16 126:23	largely 63:18 larger 89:5 largest 37:16 43:15 latest 13:8 law 34:25 lawyer 34:17 led 112:3 left 106:20 107:3 legal 38:21 85:23 106:7 124:23 level 20:16 41:2 41:9 65:17 levesque 2:11 3:18,20 7:16 12:14,18,25 13:3 42:7,11 52:23 53:2 75:19 89:6,12 109:14,22 115:8 117:1,5 123:14 123:18 likely 29:10 74:15 98:19	list 27:16 39:9 48:10 55:2 64:3 listed 53:15 litigation 28:3 112:11 118:4 120:24 little 4:10 5:11 42:24 61:9 88:24 89:5,16 90:21 91:15 93:5 97:15 99:1 live 4:3 24:7 65:14,15 109:4 lived 17:14 39:24 74:25 lives 16:21 17:9 living 70:4 llp 2:5 local 110:15 locals 109:2 located 60:6 64:14 66:1 69:22 70:1 look 7:24 10:16 11:6 15:21 18:23 19:3,9 22:23,24 23:23 23:25 24:3,6,14 24:16,21 27:19 28:12 40:9,20 45:19 52:2 53:25 54:6,16 54:22 59:15,22 60:2,8 64:24 72:12 73:6	75:15 81:16 83:7 92:6 93:11 96:17 99:25 100:3 101:1 102:22 104:10 104:19 110:8,9 110:17 112:11 112:15,16,17 113:3,7 117:25 118:18 121:10 121:13 122:11 looked 19:6 24:17 25:1 30:14 31:14 33:12,13 40:8,8 40:10,15 51:25 59:20 64:23 65:3,4 76:13 78:4 92:20 93:22 97:21 98:17 104:16,21 110:7 111:4 113:1,2 119:2 119:24 120:13 120:18 looking 8:6,7 11:12,13,13 14:19 19:17 40:12 45:20 46:7 48:19 49:1 50:11 53:25 55:2 64:8 71:7 71:10 72:3,14 77:25 90:5 96:16 100:13
l	line 27:6 60:10 64:19 65:7 66:12 125:4,7 125:10,13,16 lines 33:7 45:18 45:18 57:10 61:7 69:17 79:8 79:24 112:8		
label 20:13 labeled 116:10 land 71:8 landscape 86:13 language 21:17 large 1:24 120:11 121:15 126:6			

[looking - mean]

Page 146

101:15,16 104:24 106:20 111:19 looks 54:14 59:9 97:18 103:3,15 lost 109:12 lot 28:1 lots 43:3 low 5:23 50:21 99:12 lower 46:15 47:17,23 50:13 50:21 51:10 58:18 61:19 94:9 95:20 98:15 lowest 67:19	mailed 88:17 124:14 mails 15:22 88:19 maintain 56:17 66:4 70:19,22 71:14 72:3 maintaining 57:11 71:4 114:5 maintains 67:21 80:23 major 67:1 majorities 35:8 majority 25:21 43:11 94:25 95:7,20 97:19 99:10 100:20 112:21 114:6 117:13,22,23,23 make 5:14 18:10 38:24 43:4 46:21 47:6 54:21,25 66:12 77:7,13 89:5 100:7,16 101:3 101:11 109:17 116:18 117:25 119:16 makes 5:11 makeup 24:1,4 24:7 34:16 38:11 43:8 64:2 76:19	making 28:15 38:12 94:11,14 94:15 97:10,11 98:1,7,12 99:2 103:14 104:2 manner 122:6 map 11:7 17:11 25:15,19,22,23 25:25 26:3,11 26:15 27:19 28:1,11,11,13 28:14 33:14,16 33:19 38:6 40:6 40:12 42:14 44:16,21,24 50:17 56:5,6,11 57:8 59:14 60:7 62:20,22 63:2 63:10 64:8 66:7 66:8 68:12,13 68:16,19 69:1 71:11,20 75:15 75:17 79:8,23 82:13 89:1 99:18,18,21 102:16 104:23 105:6 106:7,20 111:17 113:19 116:23,23 117:13,15,25 118:4,8,13 119:2 120:24,25 121:4,22,23 maps 6:22 9:5 11:2,8,14,15	16:13 23:18 26:11 28:1,9,16 28:17,19 29:3,5 29:9 34:4 56:12 64:15 65:10 68:11 81:1,2,9 81:12 83:3 104:5 106:8 107:8,10 115:6 115:15,21 118:24 119:3,24 120:8,14,17 margin 79:19 marginally 82:4 marked 123:21 markedly 70:17 match 107:3 material 21:11 materials 21:8 21:12 matter 5:18 7:19,22 15:20 25:4 69:8 matters 75:17 mayor 19:6 22:21,25 mayoral 19:23 19:24,24 20:1 mayra 1:23 126:5,17 127:4 127:21 mccartan 88:21 mean 5:11 10:5 10:9,11 13:11 14:14,16 17:7
m			
madam 123:18 made 19:15 30:8 31:11 32:5 32:6,7,7,10,14 32:18,19 38:3 41:12 44:7 46:13 47:3 49:18,20,20,21 49:22 53:6 57:23 62:21 78:6 83:8 90:15 91:1,6,12,15,18 92:14 93:9,10 101:21 103:23 104:20 110:1,2 mail 124:12			

[mean - needs]

Page 147

24:23 31:10 32:18 40:8 65:8 71:6 72:17 74:2 74:13 77:15 81:13,15 96:3 105:23,24 110:4 122:17 means 41:3 43:19 measure 30:13 31:13 61:13 71:3 medical 6:6 medication 5:16 meeting 105:7 mentioned 16:12 19:5 37:19 68:23,25 merken 2:6 5:21 7:13 12:11,16 12:19 42:5,9 52:20 75:21 85:22 89:4,9,11 105:13 109:19 115:10,13 116:25 123:16 124:1 methodology 11:10,12 14:2 14:11,15,20 15:2 82:24 83:2 83:6 miami 1:7 3:21 6:22 9:12 28:7 34:3 35:20,23	108:6,7,7 116:14 119:13 124:3 125:1 126:3 127:2 miami's 80:11 mind 25:12 28:25 58:6 71:15 90:9 minimal 30:10 30:12 91:13 minorities 35:14 minority 35:14 40:4,14 120:11 minute 52:21 75:20 109:16 minutes 52:22 monday 1:15 morning 3:19 4:7 5:16 motivated 30:9 motivating 93:20 motivation 33:21 69:12 113:19 motivations 67:17 72:8 77:8 109:24 move 33:3 45:7 48:11 67:15 89:16 90:8 98:13,14 moved 24:14 25:11 27:6 30:23,24 31:2,4	31:14,15 32:2,3 33:11 45:5,9 46:1,3,5,9 47:21 49:12,13 50:24 51:20 52:1,5,7 53:17,20,22 54:9 55:2,4,7,10 55:12,18 58:15 58:24 59:6,11 59:17 61:17,21 61:25,25 67:11 67:12,13 69:21 69:25 77:20 81:15,17,18 90:3,6 92:5 93:24,24 94:8 95:6,19,21 96:9 96:12 97:9 98:4 98:8,11 99:9,12 101:2,6,10 102:1,9,11 103:16 104:21 104:22 113:13 121:13 movement 91:15 103:13 104:12,15 movements 90:18 96:5 100:11,14 113:17 moves 31:6,8 moving 96:20 97:17,18,20 102:25 103:6,10	moy 11:4 19:5 22:20 88:11 mpd 106:16 multiple 104:25 n n 2:16,19 name 3:19,22 8:22 14:20 26:7 names 22:14 narrative 52:9 narrow 8:12 natural 54:24 nature 116:19 nearby 31:16 necessarily 22:7 35:2 51:23 57:24 60:18 65:5 90:13 117:20 necessary 23:2 need 5:9,24 6:3 9:21 26:25 27:1 27:12 38:10 42:25 47:3 60:16 71:16 104:11 118:16 118:18 needed 9:12 37:4,8,14,18 38:3 42:12 43:20 67:12 77:12,17 78:10 needs 34:19 37:7 38:19
---	---	---	--

[neighborhoods - order]

Page 148

neighborhoods 56:18 123:7	number 7:14 48:10 74:25	odds 72:7	123:1,18
neil 8:21	77:19 80:25	offer 6:12 84:2	old 64:19
net 50:8 106:16	85:19 101:25	office 70:5	once 11:5 88:17
never 69:19	102:8 117:14	official 23:4	ones 27:14,16
new 18:13 33:11	numbers 31:18	107:23	30:24 33:10,11
33:19 36:20	31:24 74:1 75:5	offset 76:3 77:1	53:15 58:24
38:16 68:11	113:21	offsets 77:10	72:1 93:24
69:16	numerical 73:21	oh 23:11	opening 119:12
news 11:16,17	ny 126:24	okay 4:6 6:18	opinion 6:13
11:18,24 68:7,9	o	8:10,12 10:23	29:1,3 31:6
68:10,16 69:6	oath 126:1	12:8,24,25	33:20 61:8
nicholas 2:14	object 4:20	13:13 14:1 17:8	62:15 67:4,8,9
nick 6:14 8:20	objection 4:22	17:24 19:8 21:8	72:2 75:10,11
nod 5:10	7:13 85:22	22:8 28:15 29:8	75:12,16 76:2
non 85:16,21	105:13	31:21 36:6	76:25 81:21,25
86:3,5,10,12	observation	39:10 40:23	82:14 84:2
nonpartisan	61:23 94:13,15	41:20 42:4	91:25 92:19,23
20:8 21:14	94:17,18 95:3	44:15 46:7	94:1,19 105:2
78:17,19,25,25	97:23	51:23 52:2	117:7,9 118:12
111:7 115:24	observations	53:18,24 54:4	opinions 8:25
nonracial 85:17	95:18 97:10	55:9 58:21 60:1	10:1,4 11:25
normal 57:10	98:2,7,13 99:2	67:3 68:13 74:1	14:8 25:6 26:22
north 107:6	99:13,16	75:18 78:13	30:19 34:21
notably 94:24	observe 61:13	87:8,11,15 89:1	44:2 57:13 77:6
notary 1:23	observed 33:5	89:3,9 91:11	112:13 123:6
126:5,18	observing 29:8	92:23 95:1,23	opposite 73:13
note 50:5 124:9	obviously 6:6	96:15 97:17	101:22
notes 17:24 18:1	occur 37:7	98:25 101:1	option 54:23
70:6 127:10	occurred 44:7	102:2,10 103:5	112:16
notice 1:25	116:16	103:17,21 104:7	options 38:8
121:25	october 1:15	104:23 106:13	81:18 101:15,24
noting 93:17	124:2,4 125:2	109:14 110:12	104:10
101:25	126:9,11 127:17	110:18 114:13	order 82:9
		117:1 118:2,16	83:16 123:19
		120:22 121:11	

[ordering - performed]

Page 149

ordering 43:21 43:24 44:3 124:14 organize 20:14 outline 30:21 outperform 111:8 outside 26:10 66:2,12 112:19 overall 30:14,16 39:10 83:17 91:16 98:19 102:8 106:14 overpopulated 37:10 overtown 103:19,21 104:16,18,20,24 105:1,3,8,10,20 105:22,24 106:1 106:9,15,23 107:1,16,23 108:18,21,22,24 109:4,7,8,11 123:9	57:15 61:15,16 70:12 73:22 75:23 78:15 80:25 82:1 84:4 89:23 91:14 94:7,10 96:8,11 106:13 113:12 116:9 121:22 125:4,7,10,13 125:16 pages 127:9 paid 33:14 panel 106:21 paper 12:12 papers 13:17 paragraph 14:10 15:13 30:7 33:5 35:25 39:1 44:6 73:8 76:21 89:25 91:13 paraphrasing 95:11 parlance 56:22 part 17:10 42:13 44:20 51:20 65:18 70:14 76:10 84:11 95:2 102:5 108:23 113:10 116:1 118:5 121:22 122:15,17 123:5 123:10	particular 15:5 22:13 57:24 62:24 69:5 71:11 82:12 86:9 104:12 114:15,22,25 particularly 4:8 9:16 76:13 81:4 parties 124:14 127:12,14 partisan 19:13 19:17,18 20:23 78:20,23,23 79:3,4 86:14 109:24 114:10 114:12,18 116:19 partisanship 20:3,13,19 78:15 79:1,6 110:13 111:14 111:19 114:13 parts 108:24 115:2,3 party 22:5 79:8 passed 29:21 30:1 79:19,23 pattern 52:14 patterns 10:17 11:7,13 14:19 34:5 83:15 penalties 125:20 pending 6:8,9 pennsylvania 2:6	people 4:9 26:10 37:13 77:18,19 100:25 101:18 102:1,8,10 percent 35:24 36:10,16,19 39:12,13,13,21 39:22 46:8,15 46:22 47:1,9,13 47:15,17,19 48:20 49:1 52:4 52:6,15,16 62:4 62:10,11 73:23 77:19 86:24,25 87:10,10 94:10 113:13,24 117:14,16 118:9 118:9,10,11 percentage 39:11 46:16 52:4,17,19,19 62:9 88:6 117:16 percentages 48:4 114:7 perform 11:11 24:24 34:15 110:5,16 111:1 112:22 117:17 performance 24:21,23 110:3 110:4 performed 115:17
p			
p.m. 1:16 123:24 page 2:20 12:22 13:22 18:15 28:5 30:6,7,25 34:3 35:8 36:4,5 39:1,2 43:12 48:14,17 53:3 53:18,21 54:1,7			

[performing - population]

Page 150

performing	29:15,17,19	106:2 107:4,5	67:19 78:5
19:4	30:3,9,20 31:18	110:1,2,13,14	90:20
performs 34:20	31:19,19,24	112:2,2,18,24	points 4:20 16:9
35:1	32:16 33:25	116:15 117:6,9	52:19,19 57:12
perjury 125:20	36:2,11,12,13	117:9,10 118:3	117:16
person 26:12	36:18,21,25	118:23,23,23	police 108:6
79:6	37:4,11,23,25	119:7,7,8,11,14	policy 20:17,17
personal 14:3	38:10,13,14,16	119:16,23 120:4	political 14:11
personally	38:16,17,19,20	120:16,17,17,18	14:16 20:14
126:23	38:24 39:6,7,15	121:7,9,14	24:21,23 58:6
perspective 78:6	39:16,18,19	122:4,9,10,11	politically 20:6
philadelphia	41:13 43:13	122:14	politics 68:10,22
2:6	46:2 47:2,16	plans 12:3 27:18	79:20 80:11
pick 77:13 78:7	48:1,2,21,22	28:3 29:20,23	population 9:13
picked 76:16	49:3,14,20,21	30:11 44:17	23:19,21,22
77:21	49:23 53:4,25	71:8 82:5 90:5	32:4,23 35:4,20
picking 77:23	54:3,5,5,6,6,9	90:15,22 93:1	35:23 37:5,7,14
78:2	62:3,5 71:24,24	93:12,13 112:12	40:4,25 41:15
picture 107:3	79:19 80:5,21	112:15,21 113:4	42:13,13,21,23
pieces 28:22	80:22 81:7,22	115:18 119:15	43:4,20 46:8
pit 18:12	82:4,7,10 83:19	119:17,18,25,25	47:10,14,20,24
place 16:8 52:22	83:21,23,23,24	120:3,6 122:3,5	48:7,21 49:2,10
placed 45:23	83:25 84:3 85:9	123:2	49:25 50:1,3,4
49:24	85:12,13 86:17	plausible 70:24	50:21 51:10,21
places 58:19	86:17,17,18,21	play 111:24	52:7,10,11 59:2
plaintiffs 1:5	86:21,23 87:3,3	please 3:6,22	60:11,13 61:20
2:4 9:14 10:12	87:4,6,7,7,14,16	5:1 6:4 33:2	62:2 63:12,18
27:18 28:2	87:16,21,22,23	89:5,22 124:11	65:14,15 71:16
38:23 112:12,14	90:4,4,7 92:16	plurality 41:6	72:15 76:7,16
115:15,18,21	92:16,17 93:3,4	63:13	76:18 77:3,10
118:2 120:24	93:7,10,25 94:5	plus 106:23	77:13,18 78:10
121:23	94:20,24,24	point 5:23 6:3	78:11 83:14,15
plan 10:20,21	96:25 98:22,23	7:17 17:10	86:14 90:11
23:3,7 26:19,19	102:9 103:17	27:13 28:17,19	98:7 99:3 100:9
27:22,25 28:7	104:9 105:25	52:17 64:12	100:20,22 101:7

[population - proposed]

Page 151

101:23 103:10 117:15 118:11 118:21 120:11 121:19 populations 118:9 119:21 portion 51:19 59:10 60:12,12 60:14,15 66:19 97:17 109:23 122:23 portions 10:18 25:11 28:23 30:23 40:15,22 42:18 45:5,9 58:15 64:6 66:18 70:15 73:10 121:12 position 20:20 27:3 91:2 109:17 positive 18:22 possibility 32:1 possible 38:4 59:5,8 76:15 93:23 111:6 potential 18:11 practice 33:6 precinct 14:12 45:18 46:5,7 47:20 48:5,9,19 49:1,9 51:17,18 52:2 54:9,23 55:8 57:18 59:1 59:10,21 60:10	64:4,13,16,17 64:24 66:9,19 66:19,21 67:5 73:16,19,23 74:25 113:13 precincted 33:19 44:19 precincts 9:22 10:17,18 11:8 24:10,13,16,17 24:20 25:10,11 30:22,23 31:14 31:15 33:6,10 33:15,18,24 40:9,16,18,21 42:15 44:12,14 44:16,22,24 45:9,14,14,23 49:7 51:13,24 51:25 52:18 53:5,10 54:14 54:16,22 55:2 55:10,13,15 57:24 58:3,14 58:15 59:5,8,14 59:15,16,20 60:1,6,8,23 61:3 61:19 64:3,4,10 65:24 66:22 67:9 72:11 83:16 93:23 113:15,20,22 precisely 51:7 predetermined 37:6	predominant 91:8 predominated 92:24 preexisting 54:18 62:1 65:1 preference 20:16 preferences 75:15 premise 20:25 preparation 10:8 prepare 10:3,5 10:11 preparing 14:3 present 2:13 presentation 26:18 presentations 13:17 presented 3:4 26:16 27:18 118:3 preset 38:11 president 110:19 111:2,8 presidential 19:1,3,21 110:7 previous 30:11 90:6 primarily 63:15 64:23 92:4 primary 69:15	primer 15:10 printed 13:12 prior 68:19 priorities 71:19 priority 71:22 71:22 probably 4:23 45:1 61:9 71:16 96:23 117:2 probative 19:11 problem 5:6 61:11 problematic 44:4,9,25 54:13 64:2 90:9,13 91:1,3 procedure 124:24,25 proceedings 53:1 75:22 109:21 126:2 process 25:16 42:14 44:20 59:14 68:11,12 68:14,17 processes 68:20 produced 126:23,24 progress 13:16 proper 9:16,19 29:6 37:19,25 38:14 proposals 81:10 proposed 28:3 29:18,24 30:1,4
---	---	---	---

[proposed - reason]

Page 152

81:1 82:3 83:18 83:19 112:14,18 115:18,21 116:13 provide 4:12,16 9:2,6,24 114:20 provided 8:23 9:4 10:7 11:5,19 13:20 16:13 18:5 19:5 21:9 21:12 22:20 70:9 107:14 108:3,5,10 providing 4:11 56:5 public 1:23 126:6,18 publishing 14:5 purely 115:21 purple 60:12 purposes 5:8 27:7 42:20 106:8 112:12 pursuant 1:24 push 109:18 put 59:23 66:3 90:16 105:6	question 4:12 4:15,17,18,24 5:1 6:8,9 17:13 20:24 23:15 31:21 32:12 33:1 41:20 50:9 51:3,7 55:1 60:3 82:25 87:11,12 88:9 89:22 92:13 117:3 118:15 questions 4:11 4:21 5:7 83:9,12 115:9 quick 52:21 quickly 5:21 13:1 quite 28:13 102:1,2 quote 116:12	86:6 90:19 91:7 92:4,15,24 99:21,22 100:5 102:15,19,20,21 103:2,13 104:2 104:13 110:18 110:21 111:20 111:21,23 116:3 rac 19:4,8,9 21:14,17 racial 23:25 24:3,6 25:11,13 32:20 33:7 34:5 34:16 36:25 38:11 39:4 40:16 49:16 50:10 64:2,21 65:25 66:14 67:4 70:17,20 70:23 71:2 72:4 72:7,23 79:24 81:3,13,20,23 91:14,16 96:1 96:24 98:19,21 103:7,11 107:19 107:20 116:17 117:7 racialization 30:11 racialized 28:8 28:17,19 119:15 119:17,18 120:8 120:17 racially 30:9 32:25 38:12,13	54:13 72:13 78:2 92:6,21 94:2 100:3,4 103:3 112:7,24 113:5,5 117:10 117:18,24 118:13,24 119:6 119:17 raise 3:7 ran 21:24 range 8:8 rank 43:21,24 44:3 56:6 rate 7:4 rather 51:19 78:10 81:17 93:24 reach 62:15 80:18 82:19 93:10 99:19 118:23 reached 31:1 51:5 120:7,16 reaching 80:13 read 26:17 39:3 55:22 56:8 69:6 82:9 95:8 116:10,20 123:17 124:7 125:21 reading 70:11 116:12 reason 15:23 69:10 79:1 84:19 86:16
q	r		
quantify 31:22 quantifying 31:17 quantitative 14:23 15:10 quarter 100:24	r 125:3,3 r21-0485 56:4 race 9:17,20,22 10:19 19:6,12 19:13,13,23,24 19:25 20:1,9 22:22,25 28:24 29:5 31:3,5,7 33:12 35:5 41:1 43:7 51:1 53:7 57:17 58:3,12 58:16 62:1,19 67:10 71:5 80:3 80:4 83:17 86:3		

[reason - remember]

Page 153

124:9 125:6,9 125:12,15,18 reasonable 124:17 reasonably 54:20 reasons 9:13 32:4 37:5,7 38:21 50:10 85:17,20 86:1,2 86:5,11 recall 5:18 8:22 9:10 16:15 26:1 26:2 27:22 62:2 64:11 69:6 88:20 receding 70:18 receipt 124:16 received 11:1 recent 119:25 recess 53:1 75:22 109:21 recipient 92:22 98:18 100:1 recognize 122:9 record 3:23 5:8 5:15 13:1,2 127:10 records 7:24 redirect 117:4 redistrict 9:13 redistricting 12:3 18:11 23:3 23:7 39:5,14,22 41:1 56:22 57:6	61:6 71:7 redrew 41:4 reduce 66:13 refer 13:7,22 18:25 29:20 32:15 53:18 75:23 81:20 106:14,18 109:24 reference 9:8 15:14 39:3 57:18 74:2 89:24 113:16 referenced 21:13 120:2 124:5 referencing 11:19 65:25 referring 15:2 21:12,20 29:19 32:16 36:3,6 41:21 47:19 52:14 66:6 89:18 93:14,14 95:5 96:7,9 102:3 106:18 113:8,8,22 refers 74:20 reflect 17:24 52:14 104:2,24 117:7 reflected 31:23 50:14 53:8 57:24 58:2,5 59:3 60:9 76:19	85:5 105:6,25 106:9 107:5 121:9 reflection 5:15 reflects 13:8 44:12 56:14 65:25 105:7,9 regard 9:17 124:18 regarding 9:19 50:25 regardless 20:7 20:22 regards 112:1 reject 38:15 78:15 rejected 57:6 78:14 81:8 related 4:22 12:2 20:18 24:20,20 32:9 32:13 68:13 72:21 73:14 74:17 76:11 82:7 83:3 85:11 85:13 86:3 87:12 88:22 90:17 93:3,8,25 95:3 96:4 97:12 98:2,3 99:20 100:6 107:16 110:13 114:14 117:6 119:22 relates 100:19 105:19 112:5	relating 82:9 relation 59:16 62:24 72:9 93:7 relationships 11:14 relative 43:14 74:11 96:25 127:11,13 relatively 99:12 relayed 27:14 released 84:24 relevant 34:21 35:5 54:19 80:7 reliably 29:10 29:12 117:17 relied 9:25 14:3 14:7 15:14 80:17 84:8 relies 82:18 rely 84:5,6 95:15 relying 95:9 remain 37:23 remained 33:10 45:25 46:3,6,9 46:25 51:11,20 58:19 60:14 64:6 73:1,3 remedy 29:18 30:1,4 82:3 83:18,20 116:13 120:25 remember 116:7
--	--	---	--

[remind - scenario]

Page 154

remind 83:11 remote 2:1 remotely 3:15 removed 97:6,7 repeat 5:2 31:21 32:12 33:2 74:17 89:22 rephrase 5:2 7:17 16:23 20:24 66:5 91:5 92:11 replacement 38:20 report 2:21 5:18 10:14 11:25 12:5,10,15,20 12:23 13:4,20 13:23,24 14:3 16:22 17:15,22 18:15,25 27:16 27:21,24 28:6 30:5,6,22 35:25 41:22 48:10 50:5 53:4,8 54:1 57:15 59:8,22 60:22 61:16 69:7,11,14 70:12 75:24 78:14 80:14 82:2,18,18 83:13 84:5,8,9 84:20,20 85:2 85:11 90:1 93:22 104:4,17 106:13 108:2	109:24 110:11 114:15 116:6,6 116:9 119:13 123:20 127:6 reporter 1:23 3:1,6 4:13 5:12 123:19 126:5,17 127:1,4,21 reports 10:7,8 68:8,9,10,16 114:14 116:1 represent 3:21 56:3 58:6 106:6 117:10 118:7 120:23 represents 47:9 republican 21:17,18 22:5,9 22:11,16 24:24 25:20,24 110:5 113:15,18 114:1 114:5,5,6,7 republicans 20:8 80:2 request 10:24 require 35:2 43:24 requires 34:14 34:25 44:16 research 11:21 12:2 13:16 68:9 80:10 108:2,17 123:6 researched 108:14	researching 14:4 residence 67:22 68:4 69:22,25 70:4 residents 73:21 77:22 resides 63:12 resolution 56:4 82:3 83:22 116:13 respond 117:3 responding 41:20 118:15 responsible 25:17 rest 47:5 restrictive 106:15 resulted 43:13 results 11:5 18:16,23 19:6 22:21 retained 74:3,5 returned 124:16 revamp 121:16 review 11:16 25:3 27:17,20 85:12 124:6 127:7 reviewed 68:8 115:6 122:12 reviewing 80:21 rewrite 71:17	rid 50:3 right 3:7 8:3 12:17,21 32:5 43:2 58:22,23 59:18 60:19 79:2 89:18 96:12 97:16 105:17 115:9 123:16 rights 34:7,10 34:13 risk 69:19 riverside 53:22 roadways 67:1 robinson 2:9 3:20 rotate 42:23 row 55:6 rude 5:14 rule 124:24,25 rules 4:7,8 124:17 run 48:17 78:25 running 66:23 79:7 110:25 111:16 runs 63:15
s			
s 2:10 125:3 saying 102:15 says 28:6 56:17 113:9 122:10 scenario 73:11 73:13			

scientist 58:6 scientists 14:12 14:17 scope 112:19 screen 42:6 55:20 59:23 71:10 75:24 88:24 96:17 106:9 scroll 44:11 56:1 89:7 second 12:8,20 12:22 18:25 27:23,24 30:5,8 37:16 39:10 43:15 47:9 68:23 69:4 82:2 82:18 83:13 84:9,20 89:21 91:13 109:24 116:6 120:22 section 61:19 70:13 116:10 see 5:10 11:17 12:10,24 36:6 40:16 55:20,21 55:24 56:2,14 59:24 60:3 63:4 65:22 77:17 89:1 90:25 91:6 91:18 121:21 seeking 70:19 seem 119:16 seemed 68:24	seen 120:25 segments 120:11 segregated 28:24 31:7,11 31:12 32:7 38:12,13 112:7 112:24 113:6 117:10,18,24 118:13,25 119:6 segregating 31:4 segregation 34:5 37:1 49:16 72:23 selected 77:1 sense 78:6 sentence 28:6 30:8 36:7 39:2 39:10,16 40:23 95:8 separate 71:1 series 48:16 serve 6:20 78:24 95:12 services 7:2,18 7:22 8:2 set 123:17 sets 39:5,8 several 8:4 90:17 severed 109:11 shake 5:9 shape 11:7 64:15	shapes 10:19 83:17 share 12:9 55:19 71:10 75:24 88:24 shed 42:21 50:11 78:10 sheet 124:10,12 shift 67:3 shifted 50:13 64:1 shore 81:2,12 81:14 94:20 95:25,25 114:18 shored 61:25 shoring 101:22 114:4,7 shorthand 1:23 show 3:2 19:18 51:12 shown 27:11 115:14 shows 112:6 sic 33:19 44:20 sides 109:11 sign 124:11 signature 123:25 126:16 127:20 signed 124:20 126:11 significance 43:17 61:22,24 74:8,14,19,19 74:20 75:6,7	89:24,25 significant 30:17 62:16,21 74:9,11 75:8 94:2 101:4 significantly 28:22 99:18 110:2 121:15 similar 28:13 78:5 83:22 84:2 84:4 91:14 92:2 92:6 96:24 97:3 97:7,8,17 104:16,16 112:23 113:2,3 119:4,24 120:14 120:18 121:8,20 similarities 97:11 simply 45:17 79:2 83:7 93:1 120:10 single 49:9 sit 7:25 84:1 103:25 situation 31:9 size 23:20,20,21 23:22,23 37:8 58:18 74:12 75:9 86:14 100:22 slightly 39:11 sliver 89:16 small 52:15 90:11 102:1,2
--	---	--	--

[small - suggests]

Page 156

102:12 socialism 22:9 22:12 sole 95:12 solutions 124:23 somewhat 79:5 sorry 7:17 16:23 20:24 23:16 29:25 31:20,21 32:17 35:14 36:4 48:22 57:1 57:22 60:25 62:8 64:9 76:9 77:16 78:8 87:1 93:9 96:6 100:15 101:9 102:5 108:11 114:24 115:2 sort 91:5 93:21 109:17 sorted 25:13 sorting 9:22 sounds 43:2 75:21 109:19 sources 14:2 15:1 108:5 southern 1:1 southwest 70:14 spanish 6:2 speak 22:12,17 88:11,21 109:3 speaking 15:9 22:4 40:20 43:9 66:10 121:6	specific 14:23 71:21 77:8 95:5 96:15,16 97:13 specifically 15:4 40:7 65:8 122:25 specifics 34:18 speculate 16:1 21:3 69:12 86:7 86:8 speculation 76:4 77:4,5 speculative 115:21 split 33:10,13 45:6,13,13,14 45:21,22 46:2,4 54:15,15,16,16 55:13,15,18 64:3,4,24 65:3 72:12,19 73:23 73:24 75:1 115:1 122:22 splits 44:14,14 46:3,5 51:12,15 52:14 55:8 57:18 59:21 64:23,24 67:5 72:11,25 73:1,2 73:16,19 splitting 33:6,24 spot 99:1 spreadsheet 18:4	stage 11:13 stand 61:17 117:22 standard 11:12 14:11,14 15:2 82:23 83:1,6 standpoint 31:17 39:23 43:7 61:6 74:9 start 23:22 33:4 38:9 103:8 started 3:22 starting 28:17 28:19 41:14 53:20 54:1 starts 5:23 state 1:24 3:22 30:8,12,25 35:8 35:25 40:23 81:2 94:7 126:3 126:6,18 127:2 stated 125:22 statement 28:10 28:16 33:8,9 57:18 80:22,25 96:10 119:12 states 1:1 statewide 18:16 statistical 40:24 74:8,13,18,20 statistically 62:8,12,16,21 74:9 statistics 75:4 118:12	statute 124:18 stayed 52:5,7 stenographic 127:10 stenographica... 127:6 stories 68:24 story 27:3 69:6 street 2:5,10 strike 40:1 70:11 92:2 109:2 111:22 strongly 76:22 studying 14:5 subjective 75:10 75:11,11,12 subsequent 110:8 substantially 70:15 73:9 83:22 104:5 116:14 121:20 substantive 74:19 75:5,7 substantively 75:8 sufficient 35:3 38:20 sugar 5:23 6:4 suggest 75:19 113:17 suggested 124:15 suggests 44:3 77:9 100:5
--	--	--	---

[suite - times]

Page 157

suite 2:10	t	tallahassee 2:11	thank 3:6 42:7
summarize 25:6	t 2:11,19 125:3	tandem 44:7	89:11 109:19
super 43:11	125:3	teal 90:3 106:23	theoretically
94:25 95:19	table 39:4 44:11	tell 8:15 17:11	42:22
97:19 112:21	45:20 48:13	23:11 40:10	thing 6:5,7
117:13,22	51:12 53:4	60:7 71:20 77:9	41:23 56:2
support 114:18	54:14 55:4,6,11	89:19 107:9	104:17
supported 85:9	55:16 57:15	tells 27:3	things 4:15
113:21	59:9 64:7 89:24	ten 23:14 75:20	13:13 46:24
suppose 14:16	90:3,17 96:16	101:17	47:12 56:24
17:6,23 68:12	tables 48:16	tend 35:8 100:7	57:3,10 58:11
supposed 53:7	tablet 42:4	tended 81:2,12	74:21 83:7
sure 3:24 5:14	take 5:12,24 6:3	81:16	think 33:3 44:12
6:11 8:15 10:6	6:5,10 9:16,19	tendency 46:18	44:21 55:21
10:10 16:25	16:8 18:11	101:11	75:5 76:13 80:7
18:10 20:25	22:23 35:6 45:8	terms 14:7	90:12,20 93:25
23:9,13,22	51:18 52:20,23	16:21 20:9	94:23 107:7
25:10 31:22	65:5 66:8 75:20	33:12 36:20	108:4 109:16
46:22 47:6 51:4	78:10,11 82:14	40:12 43:14	112:1
52:23 72:17	100:11 102:19	56:11 63:7,10	third 39:2
107:9	102:20,21	71:4 72:7 76:7	thorough 15:7
surrounding	109:15	80:8 96:21	three 19:8 25:18
70:16 73:10	taken 1:22	102:10 104:23	29:10 32:21
76:23 78:4	58:12 78:12	111:17 123:2	41:5 42:24,25
93:23 102:23	97:2 99:22,23	testified 3:15	55:9,13 61:16
103:16,18,22	talk 4:9 76:1	116:5	87:24 94:11,21
survey 10:16	78:13 88:25	testify 5:17	95:3 108:9,10
15:15,16 84:7,8	89:13 91:17	testimony 3:8	108:15 112:21
84:10,12,16,24	104:18	4:3 115:20	117:16,21
swap 100:3	talking 24:12	116:7 124:7,16	time 16:9 26:1
swapped 53:11	48:6 53:19	texeira 1:23	41:24 45:7
100:1	58:21 63:3 75:4	126:5,17 127:4	69:21 85:2
swear 3:7	96:13	127:21	109:11 123:15
sworn 3:15	talks 13:17	text 108:4,5	times 23:10
126:9			45:15 88:13

[today - vap]

Page 158

today 7:25 84:1 103:25 115:18 115:20 together 51:15 55:9 105:6 told 9:3 25:15 25:18,20 114:14 took 51:9 55:13 75:4 top 61:15 66:12 66:24 106:20,21 107:2 122:24 total 39:12 48:7 77:19 touch 20:21 42:19 touches 42:17 tourism 107:25 tourist 107:24 towards 122:24 traditionally 65:1 transcribe 4:14 transcript 124:5 124:19 127:8,9 transcripts 25:3 85:12 124:13 translate 31:18 92:8,10 trial 2:21 12:10 12:14 13:4 trouble 69:1 true 19:20 29:14 49:6 51:23 72:23 81:6	87:23 88:1 94:5 117:8 125:22 127:9 trump 110:19 111:2,8 113:13 113:21,24 truth 3:9,9,10 truthfully 5:17 try 29:20 55:19 trying 89:23 92:12 114:1 turned 50:6 turning 94:9 twice 88:17 two 18:13 22:19 25:18,20,24 56:24 57:2 64:3 68:1 71:25 72:11 73:19 80:1,5 82:5 90:5 90:15,22 93:1 93:12,13 98:5 99:3 100:23 104:5 109:11 111:14 116:1 117:16 type 5:22 20:17 121:3 126:24 types 79:20 typically 15:5,6	49:14 82:21 83:5 86:20,23 113:3 124:17 125:20 undercuts 32:24 70:18 underneath 57:15 understand 4:24,25 15:1 20:22 21:5 33:1 38:7 41:3 45:21 51:2 53:7 57:4 59:12 76:1 82:25 92:13 93:6 102:16 105:14 106:5,10 118:19 119:8 120:15 understanding 16:6 17:1,3 21:1 22:8 34:6 41:10 47:7 56:20 63:6 63:11,17 65:13 65:13 67:24,25 70:21 74:15 83:1 105:8,10 108:20,22 114:9 understood 4:17 6:1 62:18 102:14 uniform 45:1,3 45:12 unit 51:13 54:18	united 1:1 units 65:1,2 unpacking 74:1 unusual 61:7 ups 117:2 use 10:15 11:10 14:12 15:25 16:1,3 44:16 61:12 83:13 84:22 used 14:21 15:23 20:13 48:4 54:15,16 58:9 83:1 84:19 105:3 124:20 using 50:19 51:13 64:15 utilize 44:22 utilized 14:11 21:17 utilizing 38:1
			v
			v 124:3 125:1 vacuum 46:22 47:4 49:18 vap 36:2,10,13 36:17,21,24 39:4,11,12,13 39:18,21 40:25 47:1,2,15,16 49:13 51:10,22 52:15,16 58:18 58:23 59:5 61:21 64:5 73:2 73:17,18,23

[vap - yeah]

Page 159

86:24,25 87:9 90:12 91:16 94:9,12 95:4,20 98:15 99:8,10 99:12,17 108:24 variation 42:25 various 4:20 113:3 verified 3:5 verify 17:17,20 124:8 veritext 124:13 124:23 veritext.com 124:13 verse 11:3 version 38:5 versions 26:15 81:7 107:22 versus 6:21 15:24 32:2 33:11 38:9 58:8 73:25 video 5:10 42:6 videoconferen... 1:10,16 2:4,8 126:2,8 127:6 view 117:19 visitors 108:7 visual 113:8,10 119:1 visually 121:8 voted 25:21,25 26:3 71:23 80:5	voter 57:11 123:11 voters 20:14 25:12 35:11 39:24 40:14 48:5,10 50:11 50:12 74:10 75:8 77:22,23 94:22 96:4,22 97:1 114:8 voting 10:17 32:23 34:7,10 34:13 35:19,22 40:25 47:10,13 47:20,24 48:20 49:2,10 52:6,10 59:2 60:11 61:20 63:11 76:7,18 77:2 83:14,14,15 100:8 101:7 117:15 118:8,10 118:21 vs 1:6	wanted 16:20 16:25 17:17 18:10 27:19 53:24 54:4,24 60:15 warren 2:14 6:14,15,18 8:20 way 9:15 19:16 20:14 32:22 34:20 35:1 42:23 45:1,3,6 45:12 50:18 54:16 57:4 61:7 61:10 65:11 66:22 67:6 81:21 83:2 90:16 91:7 104:1 ways 35:12 43:3 114:18 we've 29:22 59:1 60:1 72:8 website 11:4 weigh 64:20 went 86:24,25 87:9 west 122:24 western 115:2,3 122:15,17 white 39:21,24 47:10,13,15,16 61:19 63:11 65:14 77:2 110:20 118:21	whiter 77:10 wholesale 71:17 wholly 55:12 wide 62:20 witness 2:17 3:4 3:11,14 6:21 11:4 12:24 89:10 124:7,9 124:11,19 126:7 wondering 42:8 work 10:3 13:9 15:19 42:21 104:18 110:12 112:10 114:15 118:5 worked 7:7 working 13:16 88:14 works 109:18 world 38:5 worry 57:9 worse 111:1 write 73:8 116:12 writing 27:24 written 8:5 15:4 wrote 10:14
	w		x
	wait 4:12 waived 123:25 127:8 want 15:9 22:6 27:2 43:21 47:6 67:3 69:3 75:25 77:24 78:13 89:13 92:10 112:17		x 2:16,19,19 74:22,23 126:23
			y
			yeah 4:19 14:1 36:6 45:25 56:1 56:2 64:15 89:2

[yeah - zoom]

Page 160

89:10,21 96:19 105:15 year 7:9 8:5 15:15,17 29:21 84:7,13,16,24 years 14:4 16:8 18:19,24 75:3 120:21 yellow 60:12,14 106:21 yo 91:18
z
zoom 4:9 5:5 42:9

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted

fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.